


AD-A077 350

CALSPAN CORP BUFFALO N Y ENVIRONMENTAL SYSTEMS DEPT F/G 13/2
CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES OF WASTEWATER GENERATED FROM MILITARY --ETC(U)
APR 73 L K WANG DAAK02-73-C-0206
CALSPAN-ND-5296-M-1 NL

UNCLASSIFIED

| OF |
ADA
077350




①

Calspan

Technical Report

AD A 077350



LEVEL II

DDC
RECEIVED
NOV 23 1979
E

DDC FILE COPY

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

79 11 16 043

1

408 460

Calspan

On November 17, 1972 Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory (CAL) changed its name to Calspan Corporation and converted to for-profit operations. Calspan is dedicated to carrying on CAL's long-standing tradition of advanced research and development from an independent viewpoint. All of CAL's diverse scientific and engineering programs for government and industry are being continued in the aerospace, electronics and avionics, computer sciences, transportation and vehicle research, and the environmental sciences. Calspan is composed of the same staff, management, and facilities as CAL, which operated since 1946 under federal income tax exemption.

6 CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES OF WASTEWATER GENERATED FROM MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

12 47

10 Lawrence K./Wang

14 Calspan Report ND-5296-M-1

D D C
RECEIVED
NOV 23 1973

E

9 Technical reptis

Prepared for:
Department of the Army
U. S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTER
Fort Belvoir, Virginia

11 April 73

Contract No. DAAK02-73-C-0206

13

Prepared by
Lawrence K. Wang
Lawrence K. Wang
Project Engineer
Environmental Sciences Section
Environmental Systems Department

Approved by
Roland J. Pilié
Roland J. Pilié
Assistant Department Head
Environmental Systems Department

This document has been approved for public release and sale; its distribution is unlimited.

Calspan Corporation
Buffalo, New York 14221

408 460

set

ABSTRACT

The objective of this research was directed toward the identification of the characteristics of various wastewater streams generated from military bare bases. Data on the sources, volume, and nature of military wastewaters, such as laundry wastewater, kitchen and dining hall wastewaters, shower and lavatory wastewaters, human wastewater, hospital wastewater, photographic wastewaters, washrack wastewaters, and combined wastewaters, were surveyed, compiled and documented in this report.

Based on the characteristic data for field kitchen, shower and laundry wastewaters, the nature of combined wastewaters derived from these three sources at various flow proportions was mathematically calculated. The calculated data for combined wastewaters were found to be in close agreement with the measured data for actual samples.

Synthetic wastewater prepared with tap water, laundry detergent, dishwasher detergent, ground bar soap, Bentonite clay, lubricating oil and canned dog food was found to have characteristics similar to those of the combined wastewater derived from field kitchens, laundries, and showers.

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Accession For | |
| NTIS GNA&I | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| DDC TAB | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Unannounced | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Justification | |
| By _____ | |
| Distribution/ | |
| Availability Codes | |
| Dist | Avail and/or special |
| A | |

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| ABSTRACT _____ | i |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS _____ | ii |
| LIST OF TABLES _____ | iii |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION _____ | 1 |
| 2.0 SOURCES AND QUANTITIES OF WASTEWATERS _____ | 2 |
| 3.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF WASTEWATERS _____ | 5 |
| 3.1 Laundry Wastewater _____ | 5 |
| 3.2 Kitchen and Dining Room Wastewaters _____ | 8 |
| 3.3 Shower and Lavatory Wastewaters _____ | 8 |
| 3.4 Human Wastewater _____ | 11 |
| 3.5 Hospital Wastewaters _____ | 14 |
| 3.6 Photographic Wastewaters _____ | 14 |
| 3.7 Washrack Wastewaters _____ | 16 |
| 3.8 Combined Wastewaters _____ | 18 |
| 4.0 SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER _____ | 22 |
| 4.1 Materials Used _____ | 22 |
| 4.2 Analytical Methods and Apparatus Used _____ | 23 |
| 4.3 Formulation and Characteristics of Synthetic Wastewater _____ | 24 |
| 4.3. a. Preparation of Synthetic Samples _____ | 24 |
| 4.3. b. Results of Chemical and Physical Analyses _____ | 24 |
| 4.3. c. Characteristic of Synthetic Wastewater _____ | 28 |
| 5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS _____ | 31 |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS _____ | 33 |
| REFERENCES _____ | 34 |
| APPENDICES _____ | 36 |

LIST OF TABLES

| <u>Table No.</u> | | <u>Page</u> |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| 1 | Bare Base Water Requirement for 1500 Men _____ | 3 |
| 2 | Wastewater Quantities _____ | 4 |
| 3 | Characteristics of Field Laundry Wastewaters _____ | 6 |
| 4 | Characteristics of Commercial Laundry Waste- waters _____ | 7 |
| 5 | Characteristics of Field Kitchen Wastewaters _____ | 9 |
| 6 | Characteristics of Kitchen Wastewater from a Hospital _____ | 10 |
| 7 | Characteristics of Field Shower Wastewater and Related Tap Water _____ | 12 |
| 8 | Contaminants from Human Wastes _____ | 13 |
| 9 | Characteristics of Human Waste _____ | 15 |
| 10 | Characteristics of Washrack Wastewater _____ | 17 |
| 11 | Characteristics of Field Combined Wastewater _____ | 19 |
| 12 | Comparison of Analyzed TOC Data with Calculated TOC Data for Different Combined Wastewaters Collected in the Field _____ | 20 |
| 13 | Formulation of Synthetic Wastewater _____ | 25 |
| 14 | Analysis of Synthetic Wastewater _____ | 26 |

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center (USAMERDC) has authorized Calspan Corporation, under Contract No. DAAK02-73-C-0206, to develop test method(s), technique(s) or device(s) to be used for determining the optimum operational parameters in a carbon-polymer system designed for the treatment of various wastewaters generated in field military facilities. The program emphasizes the use of existing Army Standard water purification units (described in Ref. 1) as the major components of the carbon-polymer wastewater treatment unit.

A compilation of the physical and chemical characteristics of various wastewaters generated in field military facilities is one of four research tasks to be undertaken. This report summarizes the available data on the quantities and characteristics of laundry wastewater, kitchen and diningroom wastewaters, shower and lavatory wastewaters, human wastes, hospital wastewaters, photographic wastewaters, washrack wastewaters, and combined wastewaters.

Synthetic wastewater prepared by tap water, biodegradable laundry detergent, dishwasher detergent, military bar soap, Bentonite clay, SAE-10 lubricating oil and canned dog food has been analyzed for its characteristics, and is suggested for use in laboratory investigations.

2.0 SOURCES AND QUANTITIES OF WASTEWATERS

The major water-consuming operation units at a military bare base will generally consist of kitchens (including dining rooms), laundries, latrines (including lavatory and shower), a hospital, and an industrial unit (including washrack and photographic unit). These units, in turn, are the major sources of wastewater. The average water requirements for a typical 1,500-man military base, as listed in Table 1, were estimated by the U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center (USAMERDC). On the basis of water consumption totaling 56,700 gpd per 1,500 men, wastewater flow will range from 22 to 32 gpd per capita. This is due to the fact that normally only 60 to 80 per cent of water used is channelled to the wastewater flow (Ref. 2). The remainder of the water, which is spent for human consumption, material preparation, spills, evaporation, and infiltration, will not contribute to the total wastewater flow. It may be assumed that the proportionate wastewater flows arising from the aforementioned major sources would be closely related to the amount of water usages in each of these operations.

Snoeyink (Ref. 3) has also compiled data on the wastewater quantities for another military field base having the wastewater sources of kitchens, dining rooms, laundries, showers, lavatories, latrines, a hospital, wash-racks and photographic units. His data, indicated in Table 2, were estimated based on the assumption that no major overhaul maintenance or repair capabilities for military facilities are planned for the base. It is seen from Table 2 that the total wastewater of the military base for each 1000-man increment is 34,150 gpd, or approximately 34 gpd per capita. This value is in agreement with the range of 22 to 32 gpd/capita which was estimated by the USAMERDC for the wastewater flows of a military field base operation.

Additional information for the Army water requirements, the water equipment issued to the Army engineering units, and the Army adopted water and waste materiel for field operations, are indicated in Appendices I, II and III, respectively. Other information regarding the quantities of various wastewaters generated from a USAF bare base can be found from References 4 and 5.

Table 1
BARE BASE WATER REQUIREMENTS FOR 1500 MEN

(SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| | NUMBER OF UNITS | NUMBER OF PEOPLE PER UNIT | WATER USAGE GPD/UNIT | TOTAL GPD |
|---------------|-----------------|---------------------------|----------------------|-----------|
| KITCHEN | 5 | 300 | 1,800 | 9,000 |
| LATRINES | 12 | 125 | 1,500 | 18,000 |
| LAUNDRY | 3 | 500 | 2,000 | 6,000 |
| HOSPITAL | 1 | 1,500 | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| INDUSTRIAL | 9 | --- | 300 | 2,700 |
| TIPPY (PHOTO) | 1 | --- | --- | 20,000 |
| | | | TOTAL | 56,700 |

Table 2
WASTEWATER QUANTITIES*

(ALL VALUES ARE IN U.S. GALLONS PER DAY)

| WASTE STREAM | BASE SIZE (NO. OF PERSONNEL) | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| | 1000 | 2000 | 3000 | 4000 | 5000 | 6000 |
| PHOTOGRAPHIC | 1600 | 3200 | 4800 | 6400 | 8000 | 9600 |
| AIRCRAFT WASHRACK | 3000 | 6000 | 9000 | 12,000 | 15,000 | 18,000 |
| VEHICLE WASHRACK | 1000 | 2000 | 3000 | 4000 | 5000 | 6000 |
| HOSPITAL | 500 | 1000 | 1500 | 2000 | 2500 | 3000 |
| HUMAN WASTE | 550 | 1100 | 1650 | 2200 | 2750 | 3300 |
| LAVATORY AND SHOWER | 20,000 | 40,000 | 60,000 | 80,000 | 100,000 | 120,000 |
| KITCHEN | 1400 | 2800 | 4200 | 5600 | 7000 | 8400 |
| DINING ROOM (DISHWASHERS) | 600 | 1200 | 1800 | 2400 | 3000 | 3600 |
| LAUNDRY | 5500 | 11,000 | 16,500 | 22,000 | 27,500 | 33,000 |
| TOTAL | 34,150 | 68,300 | 102,450 | 136,600 | 170,750 | 204,900 |

*SNOEYINK, V.L., "USAF MOBILITY PROGRAM WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM," 1972

3.0 CHARACTERISTICS OF WASTEWATERS

Valuable data regarding the characteristics of the kitchen wastewater, the laundry wastewater, the shower wastewater, and the combined wastewaters, which are generated from the field military facilities were supplied by the USAMERDC, and are compiled in this report. Many of the other data were originated from the Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, and the Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico.

3.1 Laundry Wastewaters

Pollutants derived from laundry wastewaters consist mainly of synthetic detergents, bleaches, soaps, and soil from clothing. Some field laundry wastewaters were analyzed by the USAMERDC from August to September, 1972. Both the raw data and summarized data of the wastewater's characterization are documented in Table 3. Important data in the table are the ranges and the average values of total dissolved solids, detergents, total phosphate, total hardness, total alkalinity, 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (5-day BOD), and total organic carbon (TOC). The characteristics of the tap water used in conjunction with producing such wastewater were also analyzed during the earlier period of wastewater characterization studies in August 1972, and are reported in Appendix IV. The net amount of a specific pollutant, such as detergent, contributed by the laundry waste can be calculated by subtracting the detergent content of tap water from that of the laundry wastewater.

It is assumed that the laundry wastewaters generated from a military base are similar in composition to commercial laundry wastewaters. The characteristics of commercial laundry wastewaters have been compiled by Snoeyink et al (Ref. 3) from two texts (Refs. 6, 7), and listed in Table 4 of this report as reference. Valuable data in Table 4 are the ranges of suspended solids, total solids, volatile solids, alkalinity above pH 7.0, and oil and grease values, which do not appear in Table 3.

The 5-day BOD data analyzed by the USAMERDC was 339.0 mg/l which is close to the lower end of the BOD range (370-635 mg/l) given by References 6 and 7 for commercial laundry wastewaters (see Tables

Table 3
CHARACTERISTICS OF FIELD LAUNDRY WASTEWATERS
 (SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF WASTEWATERS | | | | | | SUMMARY | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|---------|---------|--|--|
| | A | B ¹ | C ² | D ³ | MIN. | AVE. | MAX. | | |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | 220.0 | 3,800.0 | 68.0 | — | 68.0 | 1,362.7 | 3,800.0 | | |
| pH, UNIT | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.3 | — | 7.2 | 7.4 | 7.6 | | |
| TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 410.0 | 290.0 | 800.0 | — | 290.0 | 500.0 | 800.0 | | |
| DETERGENT | 1.6 | 6.5 | 0.2 | — | 0.2 | 2.8 | 6.5 | | |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 51.0 | 48.0 | 128.0 | — | 48.0 | 75.7 | 128.0 | | |
| ORTHO PHOSPHATE | — | 45.0 | 122.0 | — | 45.0 | — | 122.0 | | |
| POLY PHOSPHATE | — | 3.0 | 6.0 | — | 3.0 | — | 6.0 | | |
| SULPHATE | 13.0 | 175.0 | 55.0 | — | 13.0 | 81.0 | 175.0 | | |
| SILICATE | 60.0 | 150.0 | 72.0 | — | 60.0 | 94.0 | 150.0 | | |
| TOTAL HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 34.0 | 30.0 | 26.0 | — | 26.0 | 30.0 | 34.0 | | |
| CALCIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 32.0 | 22.0 | 14.0 | — | 14.0 | 22.7 | 32.0 | | |
| MAGNESIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 2.0 | 8.0 | 12.0 | — | 2.0 | 7.3 | 12.0 | | |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY (Ca CO ₃) | 286.0 | 116.0 | 281.0 | — | 116.0 | 227.0 | 286.0 | | |
| CHLORIDE | — | — | 130.0 | — | — | 130.0 | — | | |
| BOD, 5-DAY | — | 339.0 | — | — | — | 339.0 | — | | |
| TOC | — | 258.0 | 14.0 | 28.5 | 14.0 | 100.2 | 258.0 | | |

NOTES: 1. FIELD LAUNDRY SAMPLE ANALYZED ON 3 AUGUST 1972;
 2. POST LAUNDROMAT SAMPLE ANALYZED ON 14 AUGUST 1972;
 3. POST LAUNDROMAT SAMPLE ANALYZED ON 5 SEPTEMBER 1972.

Table 4
 CHARACTERISTICS OF COMMERCIAL LAUNDRY WASTEWATERS*

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | DATA OF ANALYSIS |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| pH, UNITS | 9.0 - 10.3 |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY | - 511 |
| ALKALINITY ABOVE pH 7.0 | 60 - 250 |
| TOTAL SOLIDS | 800 - 2,100 |
| VOLATILE SOLIDS | - 1,500 |
| BOD, 5-DAY | 370 - 635 |
| SUSPENDED SOLIDS | 210 - 540 |
| OIL AND GREASE | 170 - 550 |

*SNOEYINK, V.L., et al., "USAF MOBILITY PROGRAM WASTEWATER TREATMENT SYSTEM," 1972

3 and 4). Significant differences between the military laundry wastewater and the commercial laundry wastewaters could be the pH and total alkalinity. Both the pH and total alkalinity of the military laundry wastewaters were found to be lower than that of commercial ones.

3.2 Kitchen and Dining Room Wastewaters

Waste streams derived from the kitchen and dining hall contain dishwashing debris (detergents, soaps, greases, food and beverage left-overs, and any substances deposited on dishes), drain cleaners, household chemicals (bleaches, ammonia, polishes, waxes, solvents, ink, insect sprays), body soil and other liquid or semi-liquid substances found in the kitchen or dining hall. Raw data on the characteristics of field kitchen wastewater were received from the USAMERDC and are compiled in Table 5. Important characteristic data, as indicated in Table 5, are average pH, 6.5; total dissolved solids, 346.7 mg/l; detergent, 8.4 mg/l; total phosphate, 62.3 mg/l; total hardness, 33.7 mg/l as CaCO_3 ; total alkalinity, 145.3 mg/l as CaCO_3 ; and total organic carbon, 183.3 mg/l. The characteristics of the related tap water can be found from Appendix IV.

Gouveia and Hooton (Ref. 8) analyzed the kitchen waste stream at Williams Air Force Base, Arizona. The following are some important characteristic data reported by Gouveia and Hooton: oil and grease, 578 mg/l; total solids, 3552 mg/l; suspended solids, 2500 mg/l; chemical oxygen demand, 2800 mg/l; pH, 6.0; and specific conductance, 950 micromhos/cm. Special attention should be paid to its high COD (2,800 mg/l) value. Whether the kitchen wastewater analyzed by Gouveia and Hooton (Ref. 8) contained the ground garbage and/or the dining hall wastewater is unknown. Additional data on the characteristics of kitchen wastewater from the Air Force base are indicated in Table 6.

3.3 Shower and Lavatory Wastewaters

Wastewaters from the shower rooms will contain detergents, soaps, greases, drain cleansers, bleaches, solvents, insect sprays, body soil, urine, and occasionally vomitus and feces. When sinks are installed, additional materials such as toothpaste, saliva, and nasopharyngeal mucus will be included in the waste stream.

Table 5
CHARACTERISTICS OF FIELD KITCHEN WASTEWATERS
(SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF WASTEWATERS | | | | | | SUMMARY | | |
|--|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|-------|---------|--|--|
| | A ¹ | B ² | C ³ | D ⁴ | MIN. | AVE. | MAX. | | |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | 46.0 | 440.0 | 77.0 | - | 46.0 | 187.7 | 440.0 | | |
| pH, UNIT | 6.3 | 6.3 | 6.8 | - | 6.3 | 6.5 | 6.8 | | |
| TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 295.0 | 430.0 | 315.0 | - | 295.0 | 346.7 | 430.0 | | |
| DETERGENT | 8.2 | 8.4 | 8.6 | - | 8.2 | 8.4 | 8.6 | | |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 81.0 | 52.0 | 54.0 | - | 52.0 | 62.3 | 81.0 | | |
| ORTHO PHOSPHATE | - | 36.0 | 42.0 | - | 36.0 | 39.0 | 42.0 | | |
| POLY PHOSPHATE | - | 16.0 | 12.0 | - | 12.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | | |
| SULPHATE | 7.0 | - | 36.0 | - | 7.0 | 21.5 | 36.0 | | |
| SILICATE | 170.0 | 170.0 | - | - | 170.0 | 170.0 | 170.0 | | |
| TOTAL HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 51.0 | 28.0 | 22.0 | - | 22.0 | 33.7 | 51.0 | | |
| CALCIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | - | 26.0 | 11.0 | - | 11.0 | - | 26.0 | | |
| MAGNESIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | - | 2.0 | 11.0 | - | 2.0 | - | 11.0 | | |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY (Ca CO ₃) | 170.0 | 120.0 | 146.0 | - | 120.0 | 145.3 | 170.0 | | |
| CHLORIDE | - | 35.0 | 33.0 | - | 33.0 | 34.0 | 35.0 | | |
| BOD, 5-DAY | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | | |
| TOC | 102.0 | 214.0 | 268.0 | 149.0 | 102.0 | 183.3 | 268.0 | | |

- NOTES: 1. ANALYZED ON 16 AUGUST 1972;
2. ANALYZED ON 4 AUGUST 1972;
3. ANALYZED ON 10 AUGUST 1972;
4. ANALYZED ON 5 SEPTEMBER 1972.

Table 6
 CHARACTERISTICS OF KITCHEN WASTEWATER
 FROM A HOSPITAL *

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | DATA OF ANALYSIS |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|
| CALCIUM | 41.0 |
| MAGNESIUM | 8.0 |
| SODIUM | 171.0 |
| POTASSIUM | 10.0 |
| IRON (DISSOLVED) | 1.3 |
| AMMONIA | 4.0 |
| SILICATE | 50.0 |
| CHLORIDE | 170.0 |
| SULFATE | 66.0 |
| BICARBONATE | 181.0 |
| CARBONATE | 0.0 |
| PHOSPHATE, TOTAL | 28.0 |
| PHOSPHATE, ORTHO | 25.0 |
| OIL AND GREASE | 878.0 |
| DISSOLVED SOLIDS (CALCULATED) | 730.0 |
| DISSOLVED SOLIDS (EVAPORATION) | 1,071.0 |
| SUSPENDED SOLIDS | 2,498.0 |
| TOTAL SOLIDS | 3,552.0 |
| COD | 2,800.0 |
| pH, UNITS | 6.0 |
| SPECIFIC CONDUCTANCE (micromhos/cm) | 950.0 |

*GOUVEIA, A., et al., "CHEMICAL ENGINEERING PROGRESS," 64, 90, 1968.

No quantitative data for shower wastewater and lavatory wastewater were reported in the published literature. The data in Table 7 indicate the characteristics of the field shower wastewater. These data were received from the USAMERDC, which is the sole source of information available.

3.4 Human Wastewater

A military latrine produces mainly human excreta. According to the Ehlers and Steel's text (Ref. 9), the human excreta are small in daily volume per capita, averaging about 83,000 mg of feces and 970,000 mg of urine (including water). The human waste includes large amounts of water; some putrescible organics, amounting to about 2.5 per cent of the urine and 20 per cent of the feces; and small amounts of phosphorous, nitrogen, sulfur, and other inorganic compounds. The text also states that when the human excreta is diluted with water to form human wastewater (i. e., sewage), at the rate of 30 to 100 gpd per capita, an average human wastewater may have about 800 mg/l of solids, so composed that 300 mg/l will be in suspension and 500 mg/l in solution. About 50 percent of the total wastewater solids will be organic and therefore putrescible.

Webb (Ref. 17) has reported the contaminants from urine and feces on the weight per capita per day basis. His data are summarized in Table 8 for reference. It should be noted that Ehlers and Steels data, averaging about 83,000 mg/capita/day of feces and 970,000 mg/capita/day of urine, include the weight of water in the human wastes. Webb's data, 29,010 mg/capita/day of feces and 77,840 mg/capita/day of urine, are total solids (see Table 8) which exclude the water.

Two other sources of information (Refs. 4, 10) on human wastewater are limited to only the wastewater's solids concentration. The Garrett Airesearch Corporation (Ref. 4) and the Air Force Weapons Laboratory (Ref. 10) reported the solids concentration of human wastewater to be 15 percent, and 5.6 to 6.7 percent, respectively. It is not clear from the papers whether the human wastes analyzed were diluted with toilet waters.

Table 7
**CHARACTERISTICS OF FIELD SHOWER WASTEWATER
 AND RELATED TAP WATER**
 (SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | CHEMICAL ANALYSIS | |
|--|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| | SHOWER WASTEWATER ¹ | TAP WATER ¹ |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | 59.0 | 0.34 |
| pH, UNIT | 6.8 | 7.9 |
| TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 175.0 | 135.0 |
| DETERGENT | 1.75 | 0.04 |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 35.0 | 20.0 |
| ORTHO PHOSPHATE | 28.0 | 12.0 |
| POLY PHOSPHATE | 7.0 | 8.0 |
| SULPHATE | 22.0 | 22.0 |
| SILICATE | 55.0 | 36.0 |
| TOTAL HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 18.0 | 12.0 |
| CALCIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 16.0 | 12.0 |
| MAGNESIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 2.0 | 0.0 |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY | 136.0 | 108.0 |
| CHLORIDE | 10.0 | 10.0 |
| BOD, 5-DAY | 51.0 | - |
| TOC ² | 15.0 | - |

NOTES: 1. ALL PARAMETERS EXCEPT TOC WERE ANALYZED ON 2 AUGUST 1972;
 2. TOC OF THE SHOWER WASTEWATER WAS ANALYZED ON 28 AUGUST 1972.

Table 8
CONTAMINANTS FROM HUMAN WASTES*

| CONTAMINANTS | DATA OF ANALYSIS, mg/CAPITA/DAY | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|--------|
| | URINE | FAECES |
| ELECTROLYTES | 29,650 | 3,030 |
| NITROGEN COMPOUNDS | 44,630 | 15,070 |
| ACIDS | 2,380 | -- |
| MISC. ORGANICS | 1,670 | 10,900 |
| HORMONES | 280 | -- |
| VITAMINS | 230 | 10 |
| TOTAL SOLIDS | 77,840 | 29,010 |

* WEBB, P.M.D., "BIOASTRONAUTICS DATA BOOK," NASA, WASHINGTON, D.C.; 1967.

More detailed data on the characteristics of human wastewater have been reported by Hernandez et al (Ref. 20). Samples of human wastes were collected aboard a U. S. Navy ship, USS FULTON (AS-11), for physical, biological, bacteriological and chemical analysis. The ship's piping was modified so that the representative combined human wastewater could be collected. Twenty-five waste samples were taken over a three-day period. Results of these analyses are shown in Table 9. It should be pointed out that the chloride content and total solids content of the human wastewater on shipboard were analyzed to be high. This is due to the fact that sea water was used as the flushing water on shipboard. The human wastewater (including flushing water) generated from military latrines on land is believed to have similar characteristics as that listed in Table 9 except that the chloride content and the total solids content should be lower.

3.5 Hospital Wastewater

The wastewater streams from a hospital will contain pollutants similar to those from a military unit having the kitchen, laundry, latrines and showers. Besides, hospital wastewaters will also include blood, disinfectants, drugs, laboratory chemicals, and X-ray processing chemicals. According to a report from U. S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency (Ref. 11), the average concentrations of major pollutants in the combined hospital waste stream are: detergent, 75 mg/l as ABS; chromium, 1.05 mg/l; lead, 0.32 mg/l; phosphate, 166 mg/l; COD, 870 mg/l; and oil and grease, 43.4 mg/l. The conductivity of the waste stream averages 1,530 micromhos/cm.

3.6 Photographic Wastewater

The photographic wastewater discharged from a military base includes about 10 percent processing liquids and 90 percent washwater. Generally, the EA-4 chemical process is the common process used in a military base. The COD values of the concentrated processing liquid waste (excluding washwater) and the total combined wastewater (including washwater) were analyzed to be 78,500 mg/l and 8,108 mg/l, respectively, by Lefebvre et al at Kelly Air Force Base, Texas (Ref. 12). The COD-to-

Table 9
 CHARACTERISTICS OF HUMAN WASTE*

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | DATA OF CHEMICAL ANALYSIS |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| FLOW, gpd/CAPITA (AVE) | 20.0 |
| BOD, 5-DAY (AVE.) | 102.0 |
| SUSPENDED SOLIDS (AVE) | 236.0 |
| VOLATILE & ORGANIC SOLIDS (AVE) | 5826.0 |
| TOTAL SOLIDS (AVE) | 33000.0 |
| SETTLABLE SOLIDS, ml/l (AVE) | 5.4 |
| pH, RANGE | 7.1 - 8.2 |
| DISSOLVED OXYGEN (AVE) | 5.4 |
| COLIFORM, MPN/100 ml | 4.8 x 10 ⁵ |
| GEOMETRIC MEAN | 12.0 |
| GEOMETRIC STANDARD DEVIATION | 16 - 19 |
| TEMPERATURE °C (RANGE) | 17500.0 |
| CHLORIDE | |

*HERNANDEZ, J.W., ET AL, "TREATMENT OF SHIPBOARD WASTES,"
 PROC. OF 21TH PURDUE IND. WASTE CONF., MAY 1966

5-day BOD ratio for either the concentrated processing liquid or the total combined wastewater was estimated to be 4.4

The concentrated fractionation of photographic wastewater (excluding washwater) has very high heavy metals content; such as: lead, 0.57 mg/l; zinc, 0.30 mg/l; silver, 214.0 mg/l; chromium, 2.66 mg/l; iron, 15 mg/l; copper, 0.05 mg/l; manganese, 0.05 mg/l; and cadmium, 0.09 mg/l (Ref. 12).

3.7 Washrack Wastewaters

Simple washing operation is always expected at a military base. The washrack wastewaters can generally be subdivided into two basic fractions. The first fraction is composed mainly of those materials in the dirt films, such as soil, grease, oil, oxidized metal particles and salts. The second fraction consists mainly of detergents, soaps, and solvents which are used to clean the surfaces of vehicle, watercraft, aircraft or any other equipment.

A series of technical reports prepared by the USAF Environmental Health Laboratory at Kelly Air Force Base (Refs. 13, 14, 15, 16) have presented some data on the characteristics of vehicle and aircraft washrack wastewaters generated from some Air Force bases. Table 10 indicates some data of washrack wastewater from George, Dover and Mc Chord Air Force bases which originally were summarized by Snoeyink et al (Ref. 3). It was reported (Ref. 3) that the analyses were based on many daily composite samples being collected in a manner which excluded free oil and grease and, to some extent, settleable solids. Some washrack wastewater flows investigated even contained storm run off.

There is wide variability in characteristics and quantity of washrack wastewater from installation to installation due to the differences in operation, maintenance, type of cleaning agents, and method of wastewater transport. However, the general characteristics of the vehicle, watercraft, aircraft, and equipment washrack wastewaters are very similar to those of each other. Table 10 indicates that the COD, BOD, oil and grease, detergent, phenol, and heavy metals content would be

Table 10
CHARACTERISTICS OF WASHRACK WASTEWATER

(SOURCE: USAF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH LABORATORY, KELLY AIR FORCE BASE, TEXAS)

| PARAMETER | CONCENTRATION* | PARAMETER | CONCENTRATION |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| COD | 420-916 | PHENOL TOTAL | .02-6.7 |
| BOD | 135-300 | Cr | .08-1.9 |
| TDS | 500-580 | Cu | .04-.14 |
| SS | 27-60 | Cd | .02-.03 |
| OIL/GREASE | 4-50 | Ag | .09 |
| MBAS | 3-160 | Fe | 1-7 |
| NO ₃ | 1-7 | Pb | 1-2 |
| PO ₄ | 18-105 | Zn | 1-8 |
| | | pH | 7-8 |

* ALL VALUES IN mg/l EXCEPT pH.

high for a combined washrack wastewater. Oil and grease usually form stabilized emulsions due to the action of the emulsifier found in the detergents. These oil and grease emulsions were found to be difficult to remove from the washrack wastewater.

3.8 Combined Wastewaters

The characteristics of various combined waste streams will be important information for an operator to decide the chemicals' dosage when combined waste treatment is considered. Two possible waste combinations for the Air Force bare bases have been researched (Ref. 3). If only hospital, shower, lavatory, kitchen, dining room, and laundry wastes are combined (excluding photographic and washrack wastewaters), the total solids, suspended solids, and 5-day BOD of such combined waste will be approximately 750 mg/l, 510 mg/l and 434 mg/l, respectively. If all the aforementioned waste streams including photographic and washrack wastewaters, are combined together, the total solids, suspended solids and 5-day BOD of the combined waste will be approximately 800 mg/l, 454 mg/l and 410 mg/l, respectively. These data were estimated based on the proportions of major wastewater flows indicated in Table 2.

Characteristic data on some combined wastewaters from the sources of field showers, laundries and kitchens were received from the USAMERDC, and are reported in Table 11.

It is of interest to note that the nature of a specific combined wastewater can be mathematically estimated when both the quality and the percent flow of each participating waste stream are known. The characteristic data of laundry, kitchen and shower wastewaters have been compiled in Tables 3, 5 and 7, respectively; their TOC data are listed in the top portion of Table 12 as the control information. The minimum, average and maximum TOC data for four combined wastewaters, as listed in the first column of Table 12, were estimated based on the following material balance equation:

$$C_c = \frac{Q_1 C_1 + Q_2 C_2 + Q_3 C_3 + \dots + Q_n C_n}{\sum_{i=1}^n Q_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n (Q_i C_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^n Q_i}$$

Table 11
CHARACTERISTICS OF FIELD COMBINED WASTEWATERS
 (SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF VARIOUS COMBINED WASTEWATERS ¹ | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| | A 30% SHOWER 40% LAUNDRY 30% KITCHEN | B 50% SHOWER 40% LAUNDRY 10% KITCHEN | C 70% SHOWER 15% LAUNDRY 15% KITCHEN | D 80% SHOWER 10% LAUNDRY 10% KITCHEN | E 50% SHOWER 40% LAUNDRY 10% KITCHEN |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | 46.0 | 220.0 | 42.0 | 38.0 | 70.0 |
| pH, UNIT | 6.7 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.7 | 6.9 |
| TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 430.0 | 190.0 | 250.0 | 315.0 | 450.0 |
| DETERGENT | 12.3 | 3.5 | 8.1 | 8.3 | 6.2 |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 130.0 | 48.0 | 67.0 | 72.0 | 127.0 |
| ORTHO PHOSPHATE | 108.0 | 35.0 | 58.0 | 65.0 | 88.0 |
| POLY PHOSPHATE | 22.0 | 13.0 | 9.0 | 7.0 | 39.0 |
| SULPHATE | 35.0 | - | 5.0 | 46.0 | - |
| SILICATE | 170.0 | - | 160.0 | 150.0 | - |
| TOTAL HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 28.0 | 17.0 | 21.0 | 13.0 | 20.0 |
| CALCIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 16.0 | 13.0 | 10.0 | 8.0 | 14.0 |
| MAGNESIUM HARDNESS (Ca CO ₃) | 12.0 | 4.0 | 11.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY (Ca CO ₃) | 172.0 | 135.0 | 153.0 | 171.0 | 225.0 |
| CHLORIDE | 69.0 | 11.3 | 29.0 | 44.0 | 15.3 |
| BOD, 5-DAY | - | 100.0 | - | - | - |
| TOC | 115.0 | 146.0 | 59.0 | 38.0 | - |
| TOC ² | 96.0 | 54.5 | 44.0 | 32.0 | 112.5 |

NOTES: 1. SAMPLES A, B, C, D AND E ANALYZED ON 10th, 8th, 11th, 15th AND 9th OF AUGUST, 1972.
 EXCEPT AS NOTED.

2. SAMPLES ANALYZED ON 5 SEPTEMBER 1972.

Table 12
 COMPARISON OF ANALYZED TOC DATA WITH
 CALCULATED TOC DATA FOR DIFFERENT
 COMBINED WASTEWATERS COLLECTED IN THE FIELD

| WASTEWATER FLOW | TOTAL ORGANIC CARBON (TOC), mg/l | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|--|
| | CALCULATED ¹ | | | ANALYZED ² | |
| | MIN | AVE | MAX | | |
| 100% KITCHEN 100% LAUNDRY 100% SHOWER | 102 14 .. | 183.3 100.2 15.0 | 268.0 258.0 .. | | |
| A. 30% SHOWER, 40% LAUNDRY AND 30% KITCHEN | 40.7 | 99.6 | 188.0 | 115.0 | |
| B. 50% SHOWER, 40% LAUNDRY AND 10% KITCHEN | 23.3 | 65.8 | 137.3 | 146.0 | |
| C. 70% SHOWER, 15% LAUNDRY AND 15% KITCHEN | 27.9 | 52.9 | 89.4 | 59.0 | |
| D. 80% SHOWER, 10% LAUNDRY AND 10% KITCHEN | 23.6 | 40.4 | 64.6 | 38.0 | |

NOTES: 1. DATA WERE CALCULATED BASED ON THE PER CENT FLOWS AND THE QUALITIES OF THREE WASTE STREAMS COMPILED IN TABLES 3, 5, AND 7.

2. DATA WERE SELECTED FROM TABLE 11.

where Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 and Q_n are the flow (or percent flow) of shower wastewater, laundry wastewater, kitchen wastewater, and any other wastewater, respectively; ΣQ is the summation of Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 , ... , and Q_n ; and C_1 , C_2 , C_3 , C_n , and C_c are the concentration parameters (such as TOC, BOD, etc.) of shower wastewater, laundry wastewater, kitchen wastewater, any individual wastewater, and combined wastewater, respectively. Actual analyzed TOC data of four different combined wastewaters, as indicated in the second column of Table 12, are selected from Table 11. It is seen from Table 12 that the analyzed TOC data of combined wastewaters A, C and D are very close to their calculated average TOC values, while the analyzed TOC of combined wastewater B is close to its calculated maximum TOC.

It is apparent that data on the nature and the flow of each individual wastewater stream are necessary for estimating the nature of the combined wastewater. Much data regarding wastewater contaminant parameters at a military base are already available in this report and from other published materials. However, additional effort is still required to establish reliable information on the percent flow of every participating waste stream in the combined wastewater to be considered at various operation times, such as morning, noon, afternoon, and evening.

Another alternative is using flow meters to measure the flow of each individual wastewater stream. Knowing the flow (measured data) and nature (surveyed data) of every participating waste stream, the operator can then calculate the nature of combined wastewater, and decide the chemical dosages for wastewater treatment. The feasibility of measuring the flows of major wastewater streams in a military field remains unknown until an extensive field investigation is conducted.

4.0 SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER

Preparing a suitable synthetic wastewater for the experimentation would provide many advantages over using the actual field waste samples, such as:

- The time-consuming field sampling effort can be avoided;
- Synthetic wastewater of known concentration can be used to determine the effectiveness of an analytical technique, or an analytical instrument;
- Synthetic wastewater of constant characteristic or strength can be prepared for the laboratory optimization studies; so that the optimum operational (both chemical and physical) parameters of a wastewater treatment system can be established for a specific strength of wastewater being considered; and
- Varying the strength of synthetic wastewater in optimization studies would lead to establish the chemical dosage requirements at various influent pollution loads.

The particular synthetic wastewater was formulated in this research in a manner that its characteristic was similar to that of combined wastewater derived from military field kitchens, showers and laundries, and similar to that of domestic sewage.

4.1 Materials Used

Synthetic wastewater was prepared with tap water, biodegradable laundry detergent, dishwash detergent, ground bar soap, Bentonite clay, lubricating oil, and canned dog food. The sources of these materials are described in detail as follows:

- Tap water -- Laboratory tap water at Calspan Corporation, Buffalo, New York;
- Biodegradable laundry detergent -- Cold Power manufactured by Colgate-Palmolive Co., New York, New York. It contains sodium sulfate, sodium silicate, alkylbenzene sulfonate, soap, ethoxylated alcohol, moisture, carboxymethylcellulose, cold water brighteners, aluminum silicates, colorant and perfume;
- Automatic dishwasher detergent -- Cascade Detergent manufactured by Procter & Gamble, Cincinnati, Ohio. Cascade contains complex sodium phosphates, chlorinated trisodium phosphate, nonionic surfactant, sodium silicate, sodium sulfate, colorant and perfume;

- Ground bar soap -- Military soap received from the U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center, Fort Belvoir, Virginia;
- Clay -- Powdered Volclay Bentonite SPV supplied by American Colloid Company, Skokie, Illinois. It contains silica, aluminum, iron, magnesium, sodium, potassium, calcium, and others;
- Lubricating oil -- Heavy Duty (HD) oil, grade SAE-10, supplied by Penn Corporation, Butler, Pa.;
- Canned dog food -- Blue Ribbon Recipe (balanced and complete nutrition), packed by Rival Pet Foods, A Division of Associated Products, Inc., Bridgeview, Ill. It contains protein, fat, fiber, moisture, vitamins, minerals, and ash.

4.2 Analytical Methods and Apparatus Used

Dissolved oxygen, pH, immediate dissolved oxygen demand (IDOD), chemical oxygen demand (COD), suspended solids (SS), total solids, dissolved solids, 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (5-day BOD), total phosphate, and chloride were analyzed according to Standard Methods (Ref. 21).

Total alkalinity, total carbon (TC), and total organic carbon (TOC) were analyzed following the methods and procedures given by Environmental Protection Agency (Ref. 22). A Beckman Model 915 Total Organic Carbon Analyzer was used to analyze TC and TOC.

Dissolved protein determination was made by the Folin method (Ref. 23).

Oil and grease was determined following Standard Method (Ref. 21) with chloroform as solvent.

Resistivity was measured by a Calspan developed Spill Tracing Kit (Ref. 24).

Turbidity, total hardness, sulfate, and silicate were analyzed with a Delta Scientific Model 260 Water Analyzer (Ref. 25).

All samples being analyzed for their dissolved protein, dissolved solids, dissolved COD, dissolved total carbon, and dissolved total organic carbon were filtrated through 0.45 μ millipore filters.

4.3 Formulation and Characteristic of Synthetic Wastewater

4.3.a. Preparation of Synthetic Samples

Synthetic wastewater was prepared according to the formulation indicated in Table 13. Each ingredient was assigned a notation, such as F_1 representing laboratory tap water, F_2 representing biodegradable laundry detergent, and so forth.

In order to have thorough understanding on the characteristics of seven materials used for synthetic wastewater preparation, seven samples were prepared according to the following general formula,

$$\begin{aligned} i &= N \\ \Sigma & (F_i) \\ i &= 1 \end{aligned}$$

The first sample ($N = 1$), as indicated in Table 14, was simply tap water; the second sample ($N = 2$) was the mixture of tap water and biodegradable laundry detergent (i. e., $F_1 + F_2$); and so forth. The seventh sample ($N = 7$) containing all seven materials was the final product, synthetic wastewater.

4.3.b. Results of Chemical and Physical Analyses

Table 14 indicates the results of analyses. Its first column presents the characteristic data of tap water used for samples preparation.

It was observed that total solids, suspended solids and turbidity all increased when any one of six materials was added to the tap water.

pH values of seven samples indicated in Table 14 were closely related to their total alkalinity data. Adding laundry detergent and dishwasher detergent increased both pH and total alkalinity. The addition of soap, clay, oil and dog food had no significant effect on pH or total alkalinity.

Certain substances present in the detergents and soap reacted with hardness-causing substances (such as calcium or magnesium) in the tap water, and formed insoluble precipitates. Therefore, a reduction in total hardness of water by adding detergents and soap to water was observed (see Table 14). Resistivity of water samples, in turn, reduced when soluble hardness-causing substances became insoluble due to the addition of detergents and soap. Clay, oil and dog food had no effect on both total hardness and resistivity.

Table 13
FORMULATION OF SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER

| | MATERIALS USED | QUANTITY |
|----|--|-------------|
| F1 | LABORATORY TAP WATER: (CALSPAN CORPORATION) | 1000.0 GAL. |
| F2 | BIODEGRADABLE LAUNDRY DETERGENT: COLD POWER (COLGATE-PALMOLIVE CO.) | 2.0 LB. |
| F3 | DISHWASHER DETERGENT: CASCADE DETERGENT (PROCTER & GAMBLE) | 2.0 LB. |
| F4 | GROUND BAR SOAP: MILITARY SOAP (USAMERDC) | 0.3 LB. |
| F5 | CLAY: BENTONITE SPV (AMERICAN COLLOID CO.) | 0.4 LB. |
| F6 | SAE-10 LUBRICATING OIL: HEAVY DUTY (HD) OIL (PENN. CORP.) | 0.1 LB. |
| F7 | CANNED DOG FOOD: BLUE RIBBON RECIPE (RIVAL PET FOODS) | 3.7 LB. |

30

Table 14
ANALYSIS OF SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER

| PARAMETER (mg/L EXCEPT AS NOTED) | SAMPLES*, $\sum_{i=1}^{i=N} F_i$ | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------|
| | TAP WATER N = 1 | LAUNDRY DETERGENT + N = 2 | DISHWASHER + DETERGENT N = 3 | SOAP N = 4 | CLAY N = 5 | OIL N = 6 | DOG FOOD N = 7** |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | ~0 | 10 | 12 | 20 | 55 | 60 | 110 |
| RESISTIVITY, OHM-CM | 975 | 600 | 450 | 400 | 400 | 400 | 400 |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY(CaCO ₃) | 114 | 142 | 164 | 164 | 158 | 164 | 166 |
| TOTAL HARDNESS(CaCO ₃) | 127 | 123 | 104 | 98 | 97 | 98 | 96 |
| CHLORIDE | 27 | 31 | 36 | 34 | 34 | 32 | 34 |
| SULFATE | 34 | 120 | 193 | 185 | 193 | 180 | 200 |
| SILICATE (SILICA) | 1 | 22 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 26 | 47 |
| TOTAL SOLIDS | 206 | 428 | 647 | 674 | 718 | 728 | 876 |
| DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 204 | 326 | 494 | 472 | 466 | 428 | 478 |
| SUSPENDED SOLIDS | 2 | 102 | 153 | 202 | 252 | 300 | 398 |
| DISSOLVED PROTEIN | <15 | <15 | <15 | <15 | <15 | <15 | 30 |
| COD, TOTAL | 16 | 92 | 112 | 184 | 188 | 188 | 236 |
| COD, DISSOLVED | 12 | 80 | 88 | 116 | 109 | 124 | 124 |
| TC, TOTAL | 23 | 63 | 68 | 95 | 92 | 97 | 136 |
| TC, DISSOLVED | 25 | 50 | 57 | 64 | 61 | 53 | 58 |
| TOC, TOTAL | 1 | 41 | 46 | 73 | 70 | 75 | 114 |
| TOC, DISSOLVED | 3 | 28 | 35 | 42 | 39 | 31 | 36 |
| 5-DAY BOD, TOTAL | 0.9 | 78 | 79 | 102 | 144 | 120 | 162 |
| DISSOLVED OXYGEN(25°C) | 9.5 | 8.5 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 8.2 | 8.2 | 8.0 |
| IDOD (25°C) | 0.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 0.03 | 0.07 | 28.0 | 27.6 | 29.2 | 29.2 | 30.0 |
| OIL AND GREASE | < 3.0 | 17.4 | 20.8 | 28.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 47.4 |
| pH, UNIT | 7.3 | 9.3 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.5 | 9.4 | 9.4 |

*F₁, F₂, F₃, F₄, F₅, F₆ AND F₇, AS INDICATED IN TABLE 13, ARE THE MATERIALS USED FOR THE PREPARATION OF THE SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER

**SYNTHETIC WASTEWATER

From the silicate data reported in Table 14, it is seen that laundry detergent, dishwasher detergent and dog food contributed silicate content to the synthetic wastewater. Soap, clay and oil did not contribute any silicate content to the synthetic sample.

Total phosphate data in Table 14 demonstrate the following facts: (1) Cold Power laundry detergent, indeed, is a low-phosphate detergent; (2) Cascade dishwasher detergent is the major phosphate contributor to synthetic wastewater; and (3) soap, clay, oil and dog food contain low or no phosphate.

Of six kinds of materials added to the tap water for synthetic wastewater preparation, only laundry and dishwasher detergents were found to increase sulfate content significantly. These two materials also produced an insignificant increase in chloride.

Dissolved protein of synthetic samples was analyzed by Folin Method (Ref. 23). The lowest detecting limit was found to be 15 mg/l as gelatin. Therefore, the dissolved protein content of six control samples indicated in Table 14 (N = 1 to 6) is not meaningful. Dissolved protein content of synthetic wastewater (N = 7), however, was analyzed to be 30 mg/l. It is conceivable that most of protein present in dog food would be insoluble matter.

Oil and grease of samples was analyzed following the Standard Method (Ref. 21) with chloroform as solvent. It is understandable, from Section 4.1, that the laundry and dishwasher detergents used for sample preparation did not contain oil and grease in noticeable amounts. However, when laundry detergent, dishwasher detergent, and soap were added one by one to the water, the oil and grease showed up significantly (see Table 14). This can be explained by the fact that most of surface active substances present in the detergents and soap are chloroform extractable. The oil and grease data for Samples N = 2, 3 and 4 should be interpreted as chloroform extractable substances instead of oil and grease.

Oil and grease, total organic carbon, total carbon, dissolved COD, and dissolved solids of Sample N = 5 all decreased as Bentonite clay was added to the solution containing detergents and soap. It is conceivable that clay acted as an adsorbent as it presented in the synthetic sample.

The added lubricating oil (Sample N = 6), small amount but in emulsified form, was observed to increase turbidity, total solids, total carbon, total organic carbon, and oil and grease to a limited extent. It should be noted that dissolved solids, dissolved total carbon, dissolved total organic carbon, and 5-day BOD of Sample N = 6 were all lower than that of Sample N = 5. It has been mentioned earlier in Section 4.2, all samples being analyzed for their dissolved solids, dissolved total carbon, dissolved total organic carbon were filtrates through 0.45 μ Millipore filter papers. Oil might coagulate or agglomerate with certain dissolved or colloidal solids in the sample. Both oil and agglomerated substances could be lost during the Millipore filtration procedure. In turn, lower dissolved solids, dissolved total carbon, and dissolved total organic carbon were observed. The author, however, gives no explanation of why 5-day BOD of Sample N = 6 was lower than that of Sample N = 5.

Dog food was added to Sample N = 7, and was found to be a significant contributor of turbidity, silicate, total solids, suspended solids, dissolved protein, total COD, total TC, total TOC, 5-day BOD, and oil and grease, to the synthetic wastewater.

4.3.c. Characteristic of Synthetic Wastewater

Characteristic data for synthetic wastewater are listed in the last column (N = 6) of Table 14. Characteristic data of combined wastewater from field military installations (i. e., showers, laundries and kitchens), as shown in Table 11, and of domestic sewage, as shown in Appendices V and VI will be compared with the data of synthetic wastewater.

Comparison Between Synthetic Wastewater and Combined Field Wastewater

It is encouraging to see, from data in Tables 11 and 14, that the prepared synthetic wastewater has composition very similar to that of combined wastewater derived from field showers, laundries, and kitchens. Data for turbidity, total dissolved solids, total alkalinity, chloride, 5-day BOD and total organic carbon are in good agreement.

Synthetic wastewater has higher total hardness than that of combined field wastewater because high hardness tap water was used for preparing the synthetic sample (see Table 14); while low hardness tap water was used in the military field program during the period when the field wastewater samples from kitchens, showers and laundries were taken (See Appendix IV).

The total phosphate concentration of combined field wastewater, as shown in Table 11, ranged from 48 to 127 mg/l, probably due to the use of high-phosphate laundry detergent. With stricter legislation forcing limitations on the use of high-phosphate laundry detergent, non-phosphate Cascade detergent was selected for preparing synthetic wastewater. Although the total phosphate level of synthetic wastewater was as low as 30 mg/l, it will be closer to levels expected for future field wastewater.

A large difference exists between the sulfate and silicate contents of synthetic and actual wastewaters. This difference might also be contributable to the use of different types of detergents.

Comparison Between Synthetic Wastewater and Domestic Sewage

Much of the combined wastewater generated from a military field base would be similar to, although not exactly the same as, typical domestic sewage containing waste constituents from houses, apartments, restaurants, hospitals, and institutions. Physical characteristics of domestic sewage, as indicated in Appenix V, were qualitatively described by McGauhey (Ref. 26). Quantative characteristics of domestic sewage were found from Babbitt and Baumann's text (Ref. 27) and are listed in Appendix VI for the purpose of comparison. Critical characteristic parameters of laboratory-prepared synthetic wastewater are total solids, total suspended solids, total dissolved solids, 5-day BOD, chlorides, total alkalnity and oil and grease, which all fall in the range of domestic sewage composition. According to Babbitt and Baumann's classification (Ref. 27), the synthetic wastewater is approximately equivalent to a domestic sewage of medium strength based on the following facts:

Constituent of
Synthetic Wastewater
(all values in mg/l)

Classification
of Sewage Strength
(see Appendix VI)

| | |
|------------------------------|-----------------|
| Total Solids = 676 | Medium - Strong |
| Total Suspended Solids = 398 | Medium - Strong |
| Total Dissolved Solids = 478 | Medium - Strong |
| 5-day BOD = 162 | Weak - Medium |
| Chlorides = 34 | Weak - Medium |
| Total Alkalinity = 166 | Medium - Strong |
| Oil and Grease = 47 | Strong |

Synthetic Wastewater Alternative

If photographic wastewater, washrack wastewater and hospital wastewater are also included in the combined wastewater stream for treatment, the pollutant parameters that characterize the combined wastewater will include not only general parameters for typical domestic sewage such as BOD, solids, oil and grease, etc., but also additional parameters which quantify certain constituents present in the bare base wastewater such as toxic heavy metals, refractory organics, etc.* In such a case, additional toxic heavy metals and refractory organics should also be added to the synthetic wastewater formulation indicated in Table 13.

* These materials are not included in the wastewaters to be investigated under the present contract.

5.0 SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The task of this research was directed toward the identification of the characteristics of various wastewater streams generated from military bare bases. The data and information on wastewater characterization was gathered from available literature with assistance of the USAMERDC Project Officer, Mr. Robert Ross. A concise summary, conclusions and recommendations are given as follows:

1. Data on the sources, volume, and nature of military wastewaters, such as laundry wastewater, kitchen and dining hall wastewaters, shower and lavatory wastewaters, human wastewater, hospital wastewater, photographic wastewaters, washrack wastewaters, and combined wastewaters, were surveyed, compiled, and documented in this report.

2. Based on the characteristic data for field kitchen, shower and laundry wastewaters, the nature of combined wastewaters derived from these three sources at various flow proportions was mathematically calculated. The calculated characteristic data for combined wastewaters were found to be in close agreement with the measured data for actual samples.

3. Data on the nature and the flow of each individual waste stream are necessary for estimating the nature of the combined wastewater. Although the nature of possible contributing waste streams has been surveyed, and documented, information on the flow of each individual waste stream at various operation times is not available. It is suggested that these flow rates be investigated.

4. On-site analyses of combined wastewater characterization would, indeed, provide information to determine the chemical dosages for wastewater treatment. It is feasible only if portable field test kits for rapid determination of certain critical parameters can be developed. Another alternative is providing on-site measurement of the flows of every contributing waste stream to the combined wastewater equalization tank. Knowing the measured flow data and the surveyed nature data for each contributing waste stream, the operator can then calculate the nature of combined wastewater to be treated. The feasibility of on-site measurement of wastewater flows is subjected to further field investigations.

5. Synthetic wastewater prepared with tap water, laundry detergent, dishwasher detergent, ground bar soap, Bentonite clay, lubricating oil and canned dog food was found to have characteristics similar to those of the combined wastewater derived from field kitchens, laundries, and showers.

6. The laboratory-prepared synthetic wastewater is approximately equivalent to a domestic sewage of medium strength, according to Babbitt and Baumann's (Ref. 27) sewage classification.

7. The characteristics of tap water, detergents, soap, clay, oil, and dog food, which were used for synthetic wastewater preparation, were also quantitatively determined and discussed. With this information available, any other synthetic wastewaters can also be prepared by varying the proportions of the materials added. In the event that photographic wastewater, washrack wastewaters and hospital wastewaters are to be considered for combined waste treatment, additional substances such as heavy metals and refractory organics should also be added to the synthetic wastewater formulation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This program was sponsored by the U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research and Development Center (USAMERDC), Fort Belvoir, Virginia. The preliminary draft was reviewed on behalf of the USAMERDC by Mr. Robert Ross, Project Officer, and all other technical personnel in Sanitary Sciences Division. Their comments and suggestions are duly acknowledged.

Appreciation is also hereby expressed to Mr. Roland J. Pilie and Dr. Robert C. Ziegler, Assistant Department Head and Section Head, respectively, of Environmental Systems Department, Calspan Corporation, who reviewed this report and insured its completeness and accuracy.

Particular appreciation is expressed to the following technical personnel at Calspan who directed or conducted chemical and physical analyses of synthetic wastewater:

Mr. John G. Michalovic, Research Chemist
Mr. John G. Fisher, Engineering Assistant
Mr. Raymond N. King, Chemical Technician, and
Mr. Kurt W. Simmons, Laboratory Technician

Dr. John Y. Yang, Principal Chemist of Calspan, served in a consulting capacity for this research program. His constructive comments have significantly improved the quality of the text.

REFERENCES

1. "Operator, Organizational, Direct Support and General Support Maintenance Manual--Water Purification Unit, 420 Gallons per Hour," Department of the Army, Technical Manual No. 5-4610-208-14; October 1969.
2. Handenbergh, W. A. and Rodie, E. R., "Water Supply and Waste Disposal," International Textbook Company, Scranton, Pa., 1963.
3. Snoeyink, V. L. et al., "USAF Mobility Program Wastewater Treatment System," Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, Technical Report No. AFWL-TR-71-169, April 1972.
4. "Water and Waste Management System," AiResearch Manufacturing Company of Arizona, A Division of the Garrett Corporation, SPS-5015-R, February, 1971.
5. "Installation and Operation Manual for Bare Base Water and Sewerage Systems for the United States Air Force Systems Command, Aeronautical Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio," James J. MacLaren Limited, Toronto, Canada, Consulting Engineers To Canron Ltd., Montreal, Canada, 1969.
6. Nemerow, N. L., "Theories and Practices of Industrial Waste Treatment," Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Inc., 1963.
7. Besselièvre, E. B., "Industrial Waste Treatment," McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., New York, 1952.
8. Gouveia, A., and Hooton, K. A. H., "Potable Water from Hospital Wastes by Reverse Osmosis," Chemical Engineering Progress, Symposium Series, 64, 90, 1968.
9. Ehlers, V. M., and Steel, E. W., "Municipal and Rural Sanitation," Sixth Edition, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965.
10. Mahoney, J. A., "Military Environics--Water, Wastewater, and Solid Waste," Air Force Weapons Laboratory, Kirtland Air Force Base, New Mexico, Technical Report No. AFWL-TR-70-97, 1970.
11. "Water Quality Engineering Special Study No. 99-003-71," U. S. Army Environmental Hygiene Agency, June 1971.
12. Lefebvre, E. E., et al., "Toxic Effects of Color Photographic Processing Wastes on Biological Systems," Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly AFB, Project No. 66-5, Sept., 1966.
13. "Treatment of Aircraft Washrack Waste Water," Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly AFB, Texas, REHL Project No. 66-5, September, 1966.

14. "Water Pollution Survey, McChord Air Force Base," Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly AFB, Texas, REHL Project No. 68-2, 1968.
15. "Sewage Treatment Plant and Industrial Waste Survey, Dover Air Force Base," Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly AFB, Texas, REHL Project No. 69-11, 1969.
16. "Sewage Treatment Plant Evaluation, George Air Force Base," Environmental Health Laboratory, Kelly AFB, Texas, REHL Project No. 69-25, August, 1969.
17. Webb, P. M. D., "Bioastronautics Data Book," NASA Washington, D. C.; SP-3006, 1967.
18. Webb, P. M. D., "Feasibility Study on Recycling Waste Water," ORF, Project No. 6721, Dec., 1967.
19. Webb, P. M. D., "Incineration of Solid Waste," Metropolitan Engineers Council on Air Resource Symposium, N. Y., March, 1967.
20. Hernandez, J. W., et al., "Treatment of Shipboard Wastes," Proceedings of 21st Purdue Industrial Waste Conference, May, 1966.
21. "Standard Methods for the Examination of Water and Wastewater," 13th Edition, APHA, AWWA, and WPCF; 1971.
22. "Methods for Chemical Analysis of Water and Wastes," No. 16020-07/71, Environmental Protection Agency, 1971.
23. Orme-Johnson, W. H. et al., "Colorimetric Determination of Proteins and Free Amino Acids," Water and Sewage Works, Annual Reference Number, 1964.
24. "Spill Tracing Kit Manual," Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., Buffalo, New York, February, 1972.
25. "Procedure Manual, Delta Scientific Model 260 Water Analyzer," Delta Scientific Corp., Lindenhurst, New York.
26. McGauhey, "Engineering Management of Water Quality," McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1968.
27. Babbitt and Baumann, "Sewerage and Sewage Treatment," John Wiley & Sons, 1958.

APPENDIX I
 WATER REQUIREMENTS FOR ARMY FIELD OPERATIONS
 (Source: U.S. Army Mobility Equipment Research & Development Center)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|--|---|---------|--|
| Unit consumer | Conditions of use | Gallons per unit consumer per day ----- Temperate-Dry/cold climate ----- Jungle | Remarks | Remarks |
| 2 Man | In combat: | | | |
| | Minimum | 1/4-1 | 2-3 | For eating and drinking only; periods not to exceed 3 days. |
| | Normal | 2 | 3-4 | When field rations are used. |
| | March or bivouac | 3 | 6 | Drinking plus small amount for cooking or personal hygiene. |
| | Temporary camp | 2 | 5 | Minimum for all purposes. |
| | Temporary camp with bathing facilities | 5 | | Desirable for all purposes (does not include bathing). |
| | 15 | | | Includes allowance for waterborne sewerage system. |
| 3 Vehicle | Semipermanent camp | 30-60 | | |
| | Permanent camp | 60-100 | | |
| | Level and rolling country | 1/8-1/4 | | Depending on size of vehicle. |
| | Mountainous country | 1/4-1 | | Depending on size of vehicle. |
| 4 Locomotive | Standard military | Variable | | 95 gallons per train-kilometer. |
| | Commercial | Variable | | 125 gallons per train-kilometer. |
| 5 Hospital | Standard 2 | 50 per bed | | Includes water for medical personnel; sewage not waterborne. |
| | Standards 3, 4, 6 | 85 per bed | | Includes water for medical personnel and for waterborne sewerage. |
| 6 Impregnating plant, clothing | Maximum impregnating capacity | 2,400 | | Aqueous process. Includes 2,000 gallons for washing and cleaning purposes. |
| 7 Bakery section | Two 10-hour shifts | 1,400 | | Water for making bread and cleaning baking utensils. |
| 8 Laundry unit | Two 10-hour shifts | 4,000 | | |
| 9 Shower unit | | 9,800 | | |
| 10 Decontaminating apparatus, 400-gallon, truck-mounted | Decontamination | 4,000 | | Water obtained from natural source when available. |
| 11 Chemical base laboratory, M2 | Normal laboratory work | 300 | | |

APPENDIX II

WATER EQUIPMENT ISSUED TO U. S. ARMY ENGINEERING UNITS
(Source: U. S. Army Mobility Equipment Research & Development Center)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
|----|--------|------------------------------|---|-----------------|---------|-----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------|--------|-------------------------|
| | | | | | Unit | Equipment in each set | | | | | |
| | TOP | Num-ber of sets ¹ | Type of purification unit (treat water) (gph) | Gen-erator (kw) | Num-ber | Capacity (gal) | Distribu-tion | Purifica-tion | | | |
| 2 | 5-25G | 5 | 600 | 3 | 2 | 1,000 | 65 | 10 | 5,000 | 3,000 | |
| 3 | 5-35G | 5 | 1,600 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 30,000 | 7,500 | |
| 4 | 5-67G | 9 | 3,000 (mb) | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 50 | 54,000 | 27,000 | 12 1,000-gal tk trk. |
| 5 | 5-107G | 2 | 1,500 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 12,000 | 3,000 | HEA 2000 gal semi TRLR. |
| 6 | 5-115G | 2 | 1,500 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 12,000 | 3,000 | |
| 7 | 5-127G | 2 | 1,500 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 12,000 | 3,000 | |
| 8 | 5-137G | 1 | 600 | 3 | 2 | 1,000 | 65 | 10 | 1,000 | 600 | |
| 9 | 5-145G | 5 | 1,500 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 30,000 | 7,500 | |
| 10 | 5-155G | 3 | 1,500 | 10 | 2 | 6,000 | 125 | 25 | 30,000 | 7,500 | |
| 11 | 5-195G | 3 | 600 (mb) | | | | | | | 1,800 | |
| 12 | 5-207G | 2 | 1,500 (mb) | | | | | | | 3,000 | |
| 13 | 5-215T | 5 | 600 (mb) | | | | | | | 2,500 | |
| 14 | 5-520G | 1 | Well-drilling set. | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 5-520G | 1 | 3,000 (base) | 10 | 3 | 3,000 | 125 | 50 | 9,000 | 3,000 | |
| 16 | 5-520G | 4 | 3,000 (base) | 10 | 12 | 3,000 | 125 | 50 | 3,000 | 12,000 | |
| 17 | 5-520G | | | | | | | | | | 5 1,000-gal tk trk. |
| 18 | 5-520G | 1 | 6,000 | | | | | | | 6,000 | |

¹ Each set can equip one water point.

² One pump at steady purification rate; others at full-rated capacity for distribution (intermittent operation).

APPENDIX III

U. S. ARMY ADOPTED ITEMS OF MATERIEL FOR FIELD OPERATIONS

| LIN | SC | R I C C C | GENERIC NOMENCLATURE | | UNIT PRICE | U/I | P C A M C C | R I C | TYPE CLASS | TYPES OF REQUIREMENTS |
|----------------|----|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------|-----|-------------|-------|------------|-----------------------|
| | | | F S N O R A C V C | F S N O R A C V C | | | | | | |
| Y10972 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-285-6223 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-285-6223 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-285-6223 | | | | | | | | | | |
| *3510-285-6223 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31109 | 20 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-174-3181 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31216 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-240-1821 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31283 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-141-8613 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-141-8629 | | | | | | | | | | |
| *3510-141-8629 | | | | | | | | | | |
| *3510-141-8629 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31520 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-440-1447 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-141-8627 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-141-8633 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31754 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-141-8635 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y31931 | 20 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 3510-181-1143 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3510-478-9605 | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Y32431 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 7240-285-3933 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y32568 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 7240-285-8216 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y34527 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 6640-102-0460 | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Y34654 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| *6640-102-0460 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y34928 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 2 | E | A35 | TDA |
| 6640-102-0460 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Y35075 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | EA | 1 | C | R16 | TDA |
| 6710-356-5307 | | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX III (Cont.)

U.S. ARMY ADOPTED ITEMS OF MATERIEL FOR FIELD OPERATIONS

| LIN | FNS OR ACVC | SC | R C I C C | GENERIC NOMENCLATURE | | U/I | F C A M C C | R I C | TYPE CLASS | TYPES OF REQUIREMENTS | | | | |
|--------|---------------|----|-----------|--------------------------|---|-----|-------------|-------|------------|-----------------------|---|---------|------|------------------------------|
| | | | | FNS OR ACVC NOMENCLATURE | UNIT PRICE | | | | | | | | | |
| Y3552 | 4610-649-8385 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT VAN BODY: ELEC DRVN AC DC 115-208V 1.3 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | TDA | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 3M-2700 | | | | | | | | | |
| Y36719 | 4610-649-8386 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT VAN TYPE BODY: 1500 GPH | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | TDA | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF VAN 15-2000 | | | | | | | | | |
| Y36856 | 6630-262-7288 | 20 | 0 | 3 | WATER QUALITY CONTROL SET: RECON AND ROUTINE | SE | 1 | B | X | X | B | 3921 | 63 | TOE TDA SC 6630-CL-E03 |
| | | | | | WTR QUAL CONTROL ST | | | | | | | | | |
| Y36993 | 6640-498-9323 | 7C | 0 | 3 | WATER STILL: MX-775U | EA | 2 | G | B16 | 0 | A | SIG | 1741 | TDA |
| | | | | | WATER STILL MX-775U | | | | | | | | | |
| Y37130 | 6665-682-4765 | 8X | 0 | 0 | WATER TESTING KIT BACTERIOLOGICAL: | EA | 2 | C | B69 | 0 | A | MED | 8650 | TOE |
| | | | | | WATER TEST KIT BACTERI | | | | | | | | | DOD-C-6600-11 |
| Y37267 | 6665-471-9747 | 2E | 0 | 0 | WATER TESTING KIT CHEMICAL AGENTS: | EA | 2 | N | B54 | 0 | A | C3450 | 58 | XSB |
| | | | | | WATER TEST KIT CML M2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Y37404 | 6665-542-1239 | 2E | C | 7 | WATER TESTING KIT POISONS: | EA | 2 | N | B54 | 0 | A | C3629 | 59 | TOE TDA OP |
| | | | | | WATER TEST KIT X4A1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Y37904 | 3805-377-0600 | 9B | 0 | 0 | WATERPROOF KIT: FOR TRACTOR FULL TRACK AND GRADER MTRZD | EA | 2 | B | A12 | 0 | A | E610 | 58 | OP |
| | | | | | WATERPROOF KIT FTR F | | | | | | | | | |
| Y38141 | 4610-537-0253 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF EQUIP SET: DIATOMITE FILTER 400 GPH | SE | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | U | 6818 | 69 | TOE |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF 400 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y38212 | 4610-540-0634 | 7B | C | 1 | WATER PURIF EQUIP: TBLR MTD DIATOMITE FILTER 600 GPH | SE | 1 | D | A12 | X | A | E187 | 55 | TOE TDA OP SC 4610-CL-E03 |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF EQUIP TELR | | | | | | | | | |
| Y38486 | 4610-540-0635 | 7B | C | 1 | WATER PURIF EQUIP SET: TRK MTD DIATOMITE FILTER 1500 GPH (ARMY) | SE | 1 | B | A12 | X | A | E278 | 59 | TOE TDA OP SC 4610-CL-E03 |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 1500 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y38796 | 4610-502-8700 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF EQUIP SET: BASE MTD DIATOMITE FILTER 3000 GPH (ARMY) | SE | 1 | B | A12 | X | A | E195 | 56 | TDA OP SC 4610-CL-E07 |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF PX 3000 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39034 | 4610-502-8701 | 7B | C | 1 | WATER PURIF EQUIP SET: TRK MTD DIATOMITE FILTER 3000 GPH (ARMY) | SE | 1 | B | A12 | X | A | E278 | 58 | TOE TDA OP SC 4610-CL-E06 |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF PX 3000 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39239 | 4610-502-8706 | 7B | C | 1 | WATER PURIF EQUIP SET: MTD 3000 GPH ELEC AC 110-208V 1.3 PH 60 CY | SE | 1 | A | A12 | 0 | B | 6535 | 69 | TDE |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF 3000 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39394 | 4610-502-8707 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | A | 2166 | 64 | TOE TDA |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39442 | 4610-502-8708 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39443 | 4610-502-8709 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39444 | 4610-502-8710 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39445 | 4610-502-8711 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39446 | 4610-502-8712 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |
| Y39447 | 4610-502-8713 | 7B | C | 2 | WATER PURIF UNIT TELE: MTD: 60 GPH ELEC AC DC 110V 1 PH 60 CY | EA | 1 | B | A12 | 0 | N | PENDING | | |
| | | | | | WTR PURIF TM 600 GPH | | | | | | | | | |

APPENDIX IV

CHARACTERISTICS OF TAP WATER DURING THE PERIOD OF FIELD
WASTEWATER CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES*

(SOURCE: U.S. ARMY MOBILITY EQUIPMENT RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT CENTER)

| PARAMETER (mg/l EXCEPT AS NOTED) | CHEMICAL ANALYSIS | | | SUMMARY | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|-------|-------|
| | A. (2 AUGUST 1972) | B. (3 AUGUST 1972) | C. (4 AUGUST 1972) | MIN. | AVE. | MAX. |
| TURBIDITY, JTU | 0.34 | 0.58 | 0.46 | 0.34 | 0.46 | 0.58 |
| pH, UNIT | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.9 |
| TOTAL DISSOLVED SOLIDS | 135.0 | 140.0 | 145.0 | 135.0 | 140.0 | 145.0 |
| DETERGENT | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| TOTAL PHOSPHATE | 20.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 9.0 | 20.0 |
| ORTHO PHOSPHATE | 12.0 | 5.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 6.3 | 12.0 |
| POLY PHOSPHATE | 8.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.7 | 8.0 |
| SULPHATE | 22.0 | 12.0 | 35.0 | 12.0 | 23.0 | 35.0 |
| SILICATE | 36.0 | 37.0 | 35.0 | 35.0 | 36.0 | 37.0 |
| TOTAL HARDNESS (CaCO ₃) | 12.0 | 20.0 | 14.0 | 12.0 | 15.3 | 20.0 |
| CALCIUM HARDNESS (CaCO ₃) | 12.0 | 16.0 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 13.3 | 16.0 |
| MAGNESIUM HARDNESS (CaCO ₃) | 0.0 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 4.0 |
| TOTAL ALKALINITY (CaCO ₃) | 108.0 | 194.0 | 118.0 | 108.0 | 140.0 | 194.0 |
| CHLORIDE | 10.0 | --- | --- | --- | 10.0 | --- |

*CONTROL DATA FOR THE FIELD WASETWATERS INDICATED IN TABLES 3, 5, 7, AND 11.

APPENDIX V

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DOMESTIC SEWAGE

| Characteristic | Cause | Significance | Measurement |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| Temperature | Ambient air temperature. Hot water discharged into sewer from home or industry. | Influences rate of biological activity. Governs solubility of oxygen and other gases. Affects magnitude of density, viscosity, surface tension, etc. | Standard centigrade or Fahrenheit scale. |
| Turbidity | Suspended matter such as sewage solids, silt, clay, finely divided organic matter of vegetable origin, algae, microscopic organisms. | Excludes light, thus reducing growth of oxygen-producing plants. Impairs aesthetic acceptability of water. May be detrimental to aquatic life. | Light scatter and absorption on an arbitrary standard scale. |
| Color | Dissolved matter such as organic extractives from leaves and other vegetation (tannins, glucosides, iron, etc.), industrial wastes. | Harmless generally, but impairs aesthetic quality of water. | Light absorption on a standard arbitrary scale. |
| Odor | Volatile substances, dissolved gases, often produced by decomposition of organic matter. In water it may result from the essential oils in microorganisms. | May indicate presence of decomposing sewage. Affects aesthetic quality of water. As a test of sewage it may serve, for example, as a guide to condition of sewage when it reaches the treatment plant. | Human sense of smell, qualitative scale, and concentration at threshold of odor. |
| Taste | Materials producing odors. Dissolved matter and various ions. | Impairs aesthetic quality of water. | Not measured in unpotable water. |
| Solid matter | Dissolved and suspended organic and inorganic solids. | Measures amount of organic solids, silts, etc., hence is a measure of the extent of sewage pollution or the concentration of a sewage. | By gravimetric analysis techniques for the following: Total solids, total volatile solids, total fixed solids, suspended solids, and dissolved solids.* |

APPENDIX VI

COMPOSITION OF DOMESTIC SEWAGE

(All values in milligrams per liter)

| Constituent | Strong | Medium | Weak |
|-----------------------------|--------|--------|------|
| Solids, total | 1000 | 500 | 200 |
| Volatile | 700 | 350 | 120 |
| Fixed | 300 | 150 | 80 |
| Suspended, total | 500 | 300 | 100 |
| Volatile | 400 | 250 | 70 |
| Fixed | 100 | 50 | 30 |
| Dissolved, total | 500 | 200 | 100 |
| Volatile | 300 | 100 | 50 |
| Fixed | 200 | 100 | 50 |
| BOD (5-day, 20°C) | 300 | 200 | 100 |
| Oxygen consumed | 150 | 75 | 30 |
| Dissolved oxygen | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Nitrogen, total | 86 | 50 | 25 |
| Organic | 35 | 20 | 10 |
| Free ammonia | 50 | 30 | 15 |
| Nitrites (NO ₂) | 0.10 | 0.05 | 0 |
| Nitrates (NO ₃) | 0.40 | 0.20 | 0.10 |
| Chlorides | 175 | 100 | 15 |
| Alkalinity | 200 | 100 | 50 |
| Fats | 40 | 20 | 0 |

e Examination of Water and Wastewater, " WA, and WPCF; 1971.

alysis of Water and Wastes, " No. 16020-rotection Agency, 1971.

al., "Colorimetric Determination of Acids, " Water and Sewage Works, Annual

l, " Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory, Inc., uary, 1972.

a Scientific Model 260 Water Analyzer, " indenhurst, New York.

Management of Water Quality, " McGraw-Hill

ewerage and Sewage Treatment, " John Wiley