

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**Hydrolysis and Acidogenesis of Farm Dairy
Effluent for Biogas Production at Ambient
Temperatures**

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of**

Master of Engineering in Environmental Engineering

**at Massey University, Palmerston North,
New Zealand.**

Alistair David Broughton

2009

Abstract

Anaerobic ponds are an established technology for treating farm dairy effluent in New Zealand. These ponds produce a significant amount of methane but because of their large size, they are rarely covered for methane capture. The removal of solids prior to entering the ponds would allow for shorter retention times resulting in smaller ponds that could be covered. However, removal of solids entails loss of organic material and thus methane production. It was proposed that improved hydrolysis of solid content prior to solids separation could increase the organic content of the liquid fraction. No literature was found describing two-stage (acidogenic/hydrolytic and methanogenic) systems which achieve hydrolysis combined with solids separation of manure slurries. Hence, the aim of the present study is to examine the feasibility of such a system.

Five parameters were examined to determine favourable conditions for hydrolysis of solids and acidogenesis in farm dairy effluent. These were: 1) mixing, 2) hydraulic retention time (HRT), 3) liquid to solid ratio (dilution), 4) addition of rumen contents, and 5) reactor configuration.

Continuous mixing of cow manure sludge inhibited net volatile fatty acid (VFA) production, likely due to oxygenation. By comparison, a once-daily brief stirring regime resulted in production of 785 mgVFA/Lsludge compared with 185 mg/L from a continuously stirred reactor. Mixing had little effect on soluble COD yield.

HRTs ranging between 1 and 10 days resulted in greater hydrolysis yields (0.25 to 0.33 gCOD/gVS_{added}) compared with 0.15 gCOD/gVS_{added} for a 15-day HRT. It was hypothesised that the attachment of hydrolytic bacteria to solids prevented washout at shorter HRTs. In contrast, longer HRTs favoured VFA production. This may have been due to the planktonic nature of acidogenic bacteria, making them more vulnerable to washout at shorter HRTs.

The effects of solid:liquid ratio on hydrolysis and acidogenesis were examined with sludge:water ratios ranging from 1:1 to 1:0.25. The addition of larger volumes of

water resulted in improved acidogenesis with the 1:1 sludge:water mixture producing a liquor with 245% more VFA mass (635 mg) than reactors with a 1:0.25 sludge:water mixture (184 mg).

Addition of rumen contents was shown to have little or no effect on either acidogenesis or hydrolysis. This may have been due to a masking effect of an increased organic load through the addition of undigested grass in the rumen.

A mix, settle and decant (MSD) system and an unmixed flow-through leachbed separator system were trialled and compared as hydrolytic/acidogenic reactors. The MSD system produced $0.033\text{gVFA/gTS}_{\text{added}}$ and $0.315\text{gCOD/gTS}_{\text{added}}$ compared with $0.015\text{gVFA/gTS}_{\text{added}}$ and $0.155\text{gCOD/gTS}_{\text{added}}$ in the unmixed leachbed separator. It was hypothesised that improved mixing and longer solid-liquid contact times in the MSD system provided greater surface contact and transfer of organics to the liquid phase thereby enhancing hydrolysis.

A two-stage (acidogenic/hydrolytic and methanogenic) system was tested at bench scale. A partially mixed leachbed separator was fed with manure slurry. This retained solids while leaching out a treated feed high in organic content to be fed into a variety of methanogenic systems. The leachbed separator produced a treated feed with a VFA concentration of 562 mg/L, 120% higher than the influent slurry (255 mg/L). Soluble COD increased 60% from 1,085 mg/L in the slurry to 1,740 mg/L in the treated feed.

20-day HRT and 10-day HRT unmixed unheated methanogenic reactors, both fed with treated feed from the leachbed separator, had lower specific methane yields (0.14 and 0.11 LCH_4/gVS respectively) than a 50-day HRT reactor fed with untreated slurry (0.17 LCH_4/gVS). However, both the 20-day HRT reactor and the 10-day reactor had higher volumetric methane yields (0.033 and 0.057 $\text{LCH}_4/\text{Lreactor/day}$ respectively) than the 50-day HRT reactor fed with slurry (0.024 $\text{LCH}_4/\text{Lreactor/day}$). Gas production was shown to rise as the VFA levels in the treated feed rose. Fermentation in the leachbed followed by separation was shown to improve average gas production by up to 57% compared to separation alone.

Field-scale trials of a leachbed separator system followed by a 20-day HRT methanogenic reactor were undertaken. VFA concentrations increased from 100 mg/l in the influent to 1,260 mg/l in the treated feed, while the soluble COD increased from 2,766 mg/L to 5,542 mg/L. The methanogenic reactor produced 0.08 m³ CH₄/m³ reactor/day, four times higher than that which would be expected from a covered pond of the same size. This was hypothesised to be due to the increased biodigestability of the feed to the tank digester as well the increased organic loading rate.

This study indicates that the use of a leachbed separator would be an effective low-tech strategy for reducing the HRT of farm anaerobic ponds, and reducing the size of covers required for biogas energy recovery.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Andy Shilton, whose expertise, understanding, and patience, added considerably to my graduate experience. I appreciate his knowledge and skill in helping put together what I hope is a coherent thesis. I would also like to thank Dr. Steven Pratt and Dr. Rupert Craggs for the assistance they provided at all levels of the research project and for their insights into anaerobic digestion.

I thank Dr Graeme Attwood for his assistance and guidance in areas pertaining to the microbiology of rumen organisms. Appreciation also goes out to Amer Hashmat, Kathleen Baily and the staff at Massey #4 Dairy Farm, for their technical assistance throughout my graduate program, and to the ITS office staff for all the instances in which they helped me along the way. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the expertise and hard work of John Sykes in taking care of reactors and carrying out analytical work when it was not possible for me to do so. I would also like to thank Dr. Chris Pratt, for his friendship, exchanges of knowledge, encouragement, and nights of Trivia, netball and touch rugby, all of which made my studies far more enjoyable.

I would also like to thank my father, William and my mother, Vivienne, for the support they provided me throughout my entire life and without whose love, encouragement and constant nagging, I would not have finished this thesis. In particular, I would like to thank my wife Jan and my son Yok for their loyalty, love and support, and for enduring the trials that go along with being the family of a graduate student.

In conclusion, I recognize that this research would not have been possible without the financial assistance of Dairy Insight and the National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA) and express my gratitude to those agencies.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	v
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables.....	xi
List of Tables.....	xi
1. Introduction	1
2. Literature Review	5
2.1. Introduction	5
2.2. Biochemistry and Microbiology of Anaerobic digestion.....	5
2.2.1. Overview	5
2.2.2. Hydrolysis	6
2.2.3. Acidogenesis	8
2.2.4. Acetogenesis	9
2.2.5. Methanogenesis.....	9
2.3. Parameters Affecting Biomethanation	10
2.3.1. Residence time	10
2.3.2. Temperature	11
2.3.3. Mixing.....	12
2.3.4. Nutrients.....	12
2.3.5. Inhibitory factors.....	13
2.3.6. pH.....	14
2.4. Dairy Shed Effluent Characteristics.....	14
2.5. Pre-treatment of Farm Dairy Effluent	17
2.5.1. Solids separation	17
2.5.2. Gravity systems.....	17
2.5.3. Mechanical solids separation	17
2.6. Treatment and Biomethanation of Farm Dairy Effluent	18
2.6.1. Waste Stabilisation Ponds and Lagoons	19
2.6.2. Digesters.....	20
2.6.3. Leachbeds.....	22
2.7. System Performance.....	23
3. Methodology	26
3.1. Overview	26
3.2. Terminology	27
3.3. Experimental Procedures	28
3.3.1. Characterisation.....	28
3.3.2. Dilution Experiment.....	29
3.3.3. Mixing Experiment	29
3.3.4. Hydraulic Residence Time Experiment	30

3.3.5.	Rumen Dosing Experiment	31
3.3.6.	Column Leachbeds	32
3.3.7.	Settle and Decant Leachbeds	34
3.3.8.	Bench-scale Leachbed Separator	35
3.3.9.	Bench-scale Methanogenic Reactors	37
3.3.10.	Field Trials	39
3.4.	Analytical Procedures	43
3.4.1.	Total Solids (TS) and Volatile Solids (VS).....	43
3.4.2.	Volatile Fatty Acids (VFAs)	43
3.4.3.	pH measurement.....	43
3.4.4.	Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD)	43
3.4.5.	BOD	44
3.4.6.	Gas Composition.....	44
3.4.7.	Data Analysis	44
4.	Results and Discussion.....	45
4.1.	Characterisation of Dairy Cow Manure Slurry	45
4.1.1.	Settling Characteristics.....	45
4.1.2.	Characteristic of the Slurry	45
4.1.3.	Characteristics of the Sludge and Supernatant.....	47
4.2.	Dilution Experiment.....	49
4.2.1.	The Effect of Dilution on Hydrolysis.....	49
4.2.2.	The Effect of Dilution on Acidogenesis.....	53
4.2.3.	pH.....	54
4.3.	Mixing Experiment	56
4.3.1.	The Effect of Mixing on Hydrolysis	56
4.3.2.	The Effect of Mixing on Acidogenesis	59
4.4.	Hydraulic Retention Time Experiment	60
4.4.1.	The Effect of HRT on Hydrolysis.....	61
4.4.2.	The Effect of HRT on Acidogenesis.....	63
4.5.	Rumen Dosing Experiment.....	66
4.5.1.	The Effect of Rumen Dosing on Hydrolysis.....	66
4.5.2.	The Effect of Rumen Dosing on Acidogenesis.....	68
4.6.	Column Leachbeds.....	70
4.6.1.	Experiment LB 1	70
4.6.2.	Experiment LB2	73
4.7.	Settle and Decant Leachbed.....	76
4.7.1.	Hydrolysis in the Settle and Decant Leachbed	77
4.7.2.	Acidogenesis in the Settle and Decant Leachbed	78
4.7.3.	Comparisons with LB2	80
4.8.	Bench Scale Reactors.....	81
4.8.1.	Performance of the Leachbed Separator	81
4.8.2.	Performance of the Methanogenic Reactors	86
4.9.	Field Trials	97
5.	Conclusions	100
6.	References	106
7.	Appendices	117
	Appendix 1: Microbiological Species Involved in Biomethanation	117

Appendix 2: Empirical Design Calculations.....	119
Appendix 3: Process Models.....	120
Appendix 4: Rumen Dosing Experiment 1 Results	122
Appendix 5: Bench-top Experiments Supplementary Data	124
Appendix 6: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results.....	127

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: Change in number and size of dairy herds 1977-2008. (LIC, 2006).....	1
Figure 2-1: Different stages of biomethanation (Demirel & Scherer, 2008).	6
Figure 2-2: Fermentation pit (Craggs, 2006).	20
Figure 3-1: Photo of laboratory set-up of experiment LB2.	34
Figure 3-2: Experimental set-up of leachbed separator	35
Figure 3-3: Experimental set-up of bench scale digesters.	38
Figure 3-4: Schematic of bench-top experiment.	38
Figure 3-5: Weeping wall leachbed separator at #4 Dairy Unit.	40
Figure 3-6: Schematic of pilot trial at #4 Dairy Unit.	41
Figure 4-1: VFA percentage distribution in cow manure slurry.	46
Figure 4-2: Average COD (total), VFA and BOD contributions (%) of supernatant and sludge fractions in slurries used in this study.	48
Figure 4-3: COD concentration of effluents from reactors with different sludge:liquid dilutions and theoretical washout curves.	50
Figure 4-4: Cumulative COD mass (mg) extracted from reactors with different sludge:liquid dilutions and theoretical washout curves.	51
Figure 4-5: Comparison of VFA mass (mg) extracted from reactors with differing sludge:liquid ratios.	53
Figure 4-6: Change in pH of reactors with differing sludge to liquid ratios.	55
Figure 4-7: Comparison of soluble COD mass removed each day from mixing experiment reactors.	57
Figure 4-8: Comparison of cumulative soluble COD mass extracted from mixing experiment reactors.	58
Figure 4-9: VFA concentration (mg/l) in effluents of mixing experiment reactors. ...	59
Figure 4-10: Cumulative soluble COD (gCOD/gVS _{added}) extracted from reactors operating at different HRTs.	61
Figure 4-11: Soluble COD concentration in the reactors operating at different HRTs.	63
Figure 4-12: Cumulative VFA yield (gVFA/VS _{added}) derived from the effluent of reactors operated at different HRTs.	63
Figure 4-13: VFA concentration in reactors operated at different HRTs.	64
Figure 4-14: Soluble COD concentration of effluents in the rumen dosing experiment.	67
Figure 4-15: VFA concentration in effluent.	68
Figure 4-16: COD and BOD concentration (mg/L) of leachate LB1 reactor.	71
Figure 4-17: VFA mass and concentration in the leachate from LB1.	72
Figure 4-18: COD and BOD concentrations in the leachate from LB2.	74
Figure 4-19: VFA concentration from the leachate of LB2.	75
Figure 4-20: COD and BOD concentration in the decant from SD1	78
Figure 4-21: VFA concentration in the leachate from experiment SD1.	79
Figure 4-22: Comparisons of COD _{total} , COD _{vfa} , TS and BOD mass removed from the “settle and decant” and leachbed reactors.	80
Figure 4-23: Cumulative VFA and soluble COD mass derived from slurry and treated feed (based on 1 litre per day production).	81
Figure 4-24: Changes in total VFA concentration of treated feed from batches 2 to 5.	84
Figure 4-25: Concentration changes of major VFA species during Batch 5.	85

Figure 4-26: Methane yield based on total influent slurry for different reactor configurations and leachbed separator conditions (L CH ₄ /L slurry).	88
Figure 4-27: : Specific methane yield (LCH ₄ /gVS _{added}) plotted against condition changes in the leachbed separator.	90
Figure 4-28: Volumetric gas production for different reactor configurations and leachbed separator conditions (L CH ₄ /Lreactor/day)......	91
Figure 4-29: Gas production and treated feed characteristics for batch 4.....	92
Figure 4-30: Gas production and treated feed characteristics for batch 3.....	93
Figure 4-31: VFA and soluble COD concentrations in the influent and effluent from the leachbed separator pit.....	98
Figure 4-32: #4 Farm daily biogas production.....	99
Figure 7-1: VFA mass in effluent	122
Figure 7-2: Soluble COD mass in effluent.....	122
Figure 7-3: pH of reactors	123
Figure 7-4: Relationship between gas production and treated feed characteristics in Batch 1.	124
Figure 7-5: Relationship between gas production and treated feed characteristics in Batch 2.	124
Figure 7-6: Relationship between gas production and treated feed characteristics in Batch 3.	125
Figure 7-7: Relationship between gas production and treated feed characteristics in Batch 4.	125
Figure 7-8: Relationship between gas production and treated feed characteristics in Batch 5.	126
Figure 7-9: Propionate concentrations (mg/L) of methanogenic reactor effluents and treated feed (Batch 5).	126

List of Tables

Table 2-1: Literature values for ultimate methane yield of dairy, pig and poultry manures.	16
Table 2-2: Percent capture of total solids for separator technologies	18
Table 2-3: Literature values for volumetric gas production rates of various psychrophilic reactor configurations fed with dairy effluent.	24
Table 3-1: Operating parameters of the leachbed separator.....	36
Table 3-2: Operating parameters of bench scale methanogenic reactors.....	39
Table 3-3: Summary of experiments and their objectives.	42
Table 4-1: Concentrations of total and soluble COD, VFAs, total and volatile solids found in slurries used in this study.....	46
Table 4-2: Concentrations of total and soluble COD, VFAs, total and volatile solids found in sludges used in this study.	47
Table 4-3: Concentrations of total and soluble COD, VFAs, total and volatile solids found in supernatants used in this study.	47
Table 4-4: COD mass balance for the dilution experiment.....	51
Table 4-5: COD mass balance for the mixing experiment.....	58
Table 4-6: COD mass balance for the rumen dosing experiment.	67
Table 4-7: Total VFA mass production from rumen dosed and control reactors.	68
Table 4-8: VFA concentration of starting material in rumen addition trials.....	69
Table 4-9: COD and BOD yields from the supernatant and leachate derived from the sludge of experiment LB2.....	75
Table 4-10: COD balance for settle and decant leachbed (SD1)	77
Table 4-11: Solids removed from SD1.	78
Table 4-12: VFA data from Experiment SD1.....	79
Table 4-13: Average VFA and soluble COD concentrations of batches 2-5 from the slurry and treated feed.....	83
Table 4-14: Operating parameters of bench scale methanogenic reactors.....	86
Table 4-15: Average methane content of biogas from the bench-top reactors.	87
Table 4-16: Improvement in methane production between day 1-2 of a batch (untreated) and days 3-30 of a batch (treated).	94
Table 4-17: Literature values for volumetric gas production rates of various psychrophilic reactor configurations fed with dairy effluent.	96
Table 7-1: Species of hydrolysers and their respective substrates and products.	117
Table 7-2 : Species of acetogens and their respective substrates.....	117
Table 7-3: Species of methanogens and their respective substrates.	118
Table 7-4: B ₀ values used in Farmware design.....	121