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.

# AEROBIC THERMOPHILIC COMPOSTING OF PIGGERY SOLID WASTES

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of
the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
in Environmental Engineering at
Massey University

Surya Prakash <u>Pandey</u> July 2001

### For

My wife Rita

My children Amit, Dipak and Meena

#### **ABSTRACT**

Commercial piggery operations produce substantial quantities of solid waste requiring further treatment and disposal. Screened piggery solids contain recyclable nutrients and pathogenic organisms. Point source contribution from piggeries to surface and ground water pollution can be minimised by the application of composting process and technology. This process can serve as the treatment component of an overall waste management plan of a commercial piggery to biologically convert the putrescible to a stabilised form free of pathogenic organisms.

The rate of biochemical reaction determines the speed at which composting can proceed. Solids Retention Time (SRT) is the most important factor in determining the stability of the compost product. SRT is function of, among many other factors, the type of substrate and amendments and their corresponding reaction rate constants. In order to establish the minimum SRT, it is important to correctly derive the reaction rate constant from decomposition data. Rates of decomposition vary widely depending on the organic substrate. Although numerous guidelines are available for the design of effective composting plant, most of these guidelines or studies deal with sewage sludge or municipal solid waste. There is a complete lack of data on composting process design or reaction rates for piggery solids.

Due to these specific concerns, the main objectives of this thesis were to examine the composting process in relation to bulking material and operating conditions; analyse the disappearance of Total Organic Carbon with temperature development in order to determine first order reaction rates; and to analyse the inactivation or decay of indicator pathogens in piggery solids and sawdust composting trials and experiments.

Aerobic static pile composting of piggery solids was investigated at pilot (5 m<sup>3</sup>) scale. Sawdust was used as the bulking agent to provide additional carbon and to increase the porosity of the substrate. Composting trials, using different substrate to bulking agent ratios

and aeration frequencies were performed. The composting mixture was placed over an aerated base in the form of a pile. Temperature development, pH, Total Nitrogen, Total Phosphorus, Total Organic Carbon, Total Solids, Volatile Solids and pathogenic indicators were monitored until the completion of the trial.

The development of temperature profiles in three layers of the pile in each trial was similar and in agreement with trials conducted by various researchers. The change in moisture levels at two sampling points within the compost heap for each trial were similar. The moisture removal results demonstrated that the moisture removal from the compost pile depends not only upon a suitable temperature range, but also on the mode of heat movement. The increase in Total Solids and decrease in the fraction of Volatile Solids during the composting period in many trials were in agreement with trends described by many authors and demonstrated the decomposition process.

The nutrient analysis showed that up to 75% of initial nitrogen was conserved in the compost while there was no significant change in phosphorus concentration. There was varying order of magnitude reduction in Streptococci numbers in different trials. Similar trends were observed for total coliform (MPN) reduction. The high temperatures of the pile for prolonged periods were expected to decrease the bacterial counts to levels lower than those observed. The high values of MPN indicate that there are certain spore formers which survive the composting process.

The decomposition curve of Total Organic Carbon was used to calculate rate constant (k) over time from the temperature development data. A medium-order, Newton-Raphson algorithm, which solved non-stiff differential equation was used to solve the reaction rate equation numerically. Two models were compared for the determination of reaction rate constant. Values of reaction rate constant varied under different operating conditions of compost piles. The best values of reaction rate constant of the order of 0.008 and 0.007 per day were obtained from trial 4 that used a 25:75 (volume basis) sawdust-waste ratio; and was aerated for 10 minuted every hour. Same trial had the lowest Mean Residence Time (MRT) of approximately 115days.

Two controlled laboratory experiments at 70 °C and 60 °C, respectively were also performed to independently verify rate constants developed from pilot trials. Laboratory experiments gave similar reaction rate constants to those mentioned above. This is beside the fact that a constant temperature profile was maintained throughout the composting period in these two experiments. The average residence time of solids under controlled conditions was not very different from MRT values obtained in the same pilot trial.

A comparison of two models showed that a simple first-order kinetic model can be used for the determination of inactivation coefficient, but using Arrhenius equation incorporating the reference temperature would provide a better thermal inactivation coefficient estimates. In trial 4, inactivation rate coefficient values were of the order of 0.394 and 0.380 per day at two sampling positions, respectively. The laboratory experiments provided inactivation rate coefficient values of the order of 61.97 and 47.34 per day, respectively. The significant difference in the reduction of indicator microorganisms between pilot trials and controlled experiments emphasises that homogeneity is critical in any composting process. It also emphasises the need for a temperature feedback aeration system.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

I wish to express my profound appreciation and sincere gratitude to the following people for their contribution towards the completion of this thesis.

Professor Rao Bhamidimarri, my Chief Supervisor, for his valuable guidance, help, encouragement, and patience during my studies.

Dr. Aroon Parshotam, my Supervisor, for all his encouragement and inestimable help.

Professor Gavin Wall for assisting with the trial set-up and encouragement, and Dr. Graham Manderson for his help with understanding the bugs.

Professor Ken Milne for his encouragement and support.

Messrs Denis Lepper, Steve Lepper, Earnie Hughes and Janis Webby for letting me work on their piggeries.

Mr. John Alger, Mrs. Ann-Marie Jackson, Mr. Bruce Collins, Mr. Michael Sahayam, Mr. Bob Toes, and Mr. Lance Curry for their technical and analytical help.

My friend Dr. Satish Kumar for accommodation, food, help and support.

All staff of formerly the Department of Agricultural Engineering at Massey University for their support and friendship.

The New Zealand Pork Industry Board for funding part of this research project.

Dr. Margaret Lawton, Dr. Bob Lee, Mr. Mark Cleaver, and Mr. Peter Stephens of Landcare Research for providing time and facility to complete my thesis. Dr. Jackie Aislabie, Ms.

Rhonda Fraser and Mr. Matthew Taylor for assistance with laboratory experiments.

All staff at Landcare Research Hamilton and Palmerston North offices for their help on various occasions.

Mr. David Hunter for help with graphics.

Associate Professors Alan Langdon and Janis Swan of the University of Waikato for their support.

My parents Mr. Uma Shanker Pandey and Mrs. Satyavati Pandey for their love, encouragement and offering me education with many sacrifices. My parent-in-laws Dr. Kapil Tiwari and Mrs. Basundhara Tiwari for their love, encouragement and continued help. I also thank all my family members and relatives for their love and support.

Last, but most importantly, to my wife Rita and children Amit, Dipak and Meena for their love, encouragement, inspiration, understanding, and sharing the joy and suffering of the life during these times.

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iv TABLE OF CONTENTS v LIST OF TABLES x TABLE OF FIGURES xiii		
	CHAPTER 1	
INTRODUCT	ION	1
	CHAPTER 2	
	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1 2.2	Introduction	<u>5</u>
	2.2.2 Phosphorus       2.2.3 Potassium and other nutrients         2.2.4 Environmental concerns related to nutrients       2.2.5 Health concerns related to nutrients         2.2.5 Odour and ammonia emission       1	8 9 0 1
	2.2.7       Health risks associated with aerosols from wastes       1         2.2.8       Piggery waste management alternatives       1         2.2.9       Waste treatment alternatives       1	3
2.3	Composting       1         2.3.1 Factors controlling composting       1         2.3.3.1 Microbial population       1         2.3.3.2 Aeration       1         2.3.3.3 C/N ratio       1         2.3.3.4 Temperature       2         2.3.3.5 pH       2	5 8 9 9
2.4	Composting process fundamentals22.4.1 Biochemical aspects22.4.2 Microbiology22.4.3 Heat generation and temperature22.4.4 Heat - Temperature interaction22.4.5 Aeration, heat, and moisture removal32.4.6 Pathogenic Organisms3	.3 .7 .9 .9
2.5	Composting technologies	

			vii
	2.5.1	General aspects	33
	2.5.2	Conventional windrow process	
	2.5.3	Aerated windrow process	
	2.5.4	Aerated static pile system	
	2.3.1	2.5.4.1 Process control	
	2.5.5	Reactor (In-vessel) systems	
	2.5.5	2.5.5.1 Vertical flow reactor	
		2.5.5.2 Horizontal and inclined flow reactors	
		2.5.5.3 Agitated solid bed (or bin) reactors	
2.6	Losses	s of N from animal manures	
2.0	2.6.1	N mineralisation and immobilisation	
	2.6.2	Nitrification	_
	2.6.3		
	2.0.5		41
	2.6.4	Ammonia volatilisation	
2.7		n approach for composting systems	_
	2.7.1		
	2.7.2		
2.8	Concl	usions from literature review	
	0001		
		CHAPTER 3	
		MATERIAL AND METHODS	
3.1	Equip	ment and materials	<u>51</u>
	3.1.1	Piggery solid: Source and characteristics	51
	3.1.2	Bulking agent	51
	3.1.3	Experimental site conditions	52
	3.1.4	Aeration equipment	52
		3.1.4.1 Piping materials	52
		3.1.4.2 Material for laboratory experiments	
		3.1.4.3 Air supply	53
	3.1.5	Temperature recorder	55
	3.1.6	Sampling	<u>55</u>
3.2	Exper	imental procedure	<u>56</u>
	3.2.1	Mixing of solid and bulking agent	
	3.2.2	Aeration distribution	57
	3.2.3	Construction of static piles	
	3.2.4	Laboratory experimental setup	
	3.2.5	Aeration pattern	_
	3.2.6	Sampling procedure	
3.3		tical methods	_
	3.3.1	Chemical analysis	63
		3.3.1.1 pH measurement	<u>63</u>
		3.3.1.2 Total and volatile solids	_
		3.3.1.3 Total Nitrogen and Phosphorus	_
		3.3.1.4 Total Carbon	65
	3.3.2	Microbial Analysis	_
		3.3.2.1 Media	66

		3.3.2.2 <i>Media preparation</i>		66
		3.3.2.3 Sterilisation of media, glassware and equ		
			-	
		3.3.2.4 Sample preparation		_
		3.3.2.5 Analysis for indicator microorganisms.		
		e contraction and the cont		<u>01</u>
		CHAPTER 4		
		EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS		
4.1	Analy	sis of variables		<u>70</u>
	4.1.1	Temperature development		
	4.1.2	Total Solids and Volatile Solids		
	4.1.3	Total Nitrogen		
	4.1.4	Total Phosphorus		
	4.1.5	Total Organic Carbon		
	4.1.6	рН		
	4.1.7	Microbiological counts		
4.2	Statist	tical analysis		
	4.2.1	Data transformation		
		CHAPTER 5		
		COMPOSTING PROCESS RATES		
5.1	Introd	uction		121
5.2	Syster	m parameters		121
5.3	The ra	ate of disappearance of carbon		123
				123
	5.3.1	The reaction rate constant		_
	5.3.2	Effect of temperature		125
5.4	Result	ts of carbon degradation		128
	5.4.1	The rate of disappearance of carbon mass		128
	5.4.2	Reaction rate constant		128
	5.4.3	Effect of temperature		130
5.5	Discus	ssion on carbon degradation		133
	5.5.1	Mean residence time		134
	5.5.2	Carbon/Nitrogen ratio		136
	5.5.3	Time required to obtain required decomposition		139
5.6	Concl	usions on carbon degradation		141
5.7	Rate o	of thermal inactivation		143
	5.7.1	Kinetics of heat inactivation		143
	5.7.2	Thermal inactivation coefficient		145
	5.7.3	Effect of temperature		146
5.8	Result	ts and Discussion on thermal inactivation		148
	5.8.1	Rate of disappearance of pathogens		148
	5.8.2	Inactivation rate coefficient		148
	5.8.3	Effect of temperature		150
	5.8.4	Decimal Reduction Factor		154
	5.8.5	Limitations on pathogenic inactivation		157
5.9		usions on thermal inactivation		159

## CHAPTER 6 PROCESS PERFORMANCE

General observation	. <u>161</u>
Performance comparison between pilot scale and laboratory	scale
conditions	. <u>162</u>
6.2.1 Method of parallelism for mathematical analysis	
Decomposition activity	
6.3.1 Temperature development	. <u>166</u>
6.3.2 Moisture	
6.3.4 Nutrients	
•	
Conclusions	. <u>194</u>
CHAPTER 7	
CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATION	
Review of literature	. 197
Composting operation	. 198
Composting process performance	
Reaction rate constant (k)	. 200
Mean residence time	PERSONAL PROPERTY.
C/N ratio	. 201
Rate of thermal inactivation	. 201
Application of research	
Suggestions for future research	. 203
	206
25	. 206
	230
	. 233
•	
•	
·	
<u>-</u>	_
	. 240
	. 248
	. 240
	Performance comparison between pilot scale and laboratory conditions  6.2.1 Method of parallelism for mathematical analysis Decomposition activity 6.3.1 Temperature development 6.3.2 Moisture 6.3.3 Total Solids and Volatile Solids 6.3.4 Nutrients 6.3.5 pH 6.3.6 Microbiology 6.3.7 Reaction Rate constants 6.3.8 Inactivation rate coefficient Conclusions  CHAPTER 7  CONCLUSIONS AND APPLICATION  Review of literature Composting operation Composting process performance Reaction rate constant (k) Mean residence time C/N ratio Rate of thermal inactivation Application of research Suggestions for future research

APPENDIX 8	251
Changes in coliform (MPN) and streptococci counts during composting	
at positions S2	<u>251</u>
APPENDIX 9	254
Best fit curves to calculate parameter values for Eq. 5.8 at S1 and S	254

#### LIST OF TABLES CHAPTER 2

Table	Page
Table 2.1	Pig population (000) in various regions of the world
Table 2.2	Freshly voided pig manure characteristics 6
Table 2.3	Nutrient content (g/kg dry weight basis) of animal manures 6
Table 2.4	Characteristics of Piggery wastewater
Table 2.5	Composition of organic matter 24
Table 2.6	The relative rate of microbial decomposition of organic materials 26
Table 2.7	Number of microorganisms isolated in raw sludge 27
Table 2.8	Temperature range for microorganisms
Table 2.9	N losses during the storage or composting of animal manure 39
Table 2.10	First order rate constants at 25°C for various substrates incubated with soi
	<u>48</u>
	CHAPTER 3
Table 3.1	Aeration and sawdust-waste ratios for various trials 56
	CHAPTER 4
Table 4.1	Calculated F values and probability levels for Trial 1
Table 4.2	Calculated F values and probability levels for Trial 2
Table 4.3	Calculated F values and probability levels for Trial 3
Table 4.4	Calculated F values and probability levels for trial 4
Table 4.5	Calculated F values and probability levels for Trial 5 120
m 11 5 1	CHAPTER 5
Table 5.1	Controllable factors for composting
Table 5.2	Major compost system parameters required for optimization analysis of the
m 11 50	system
Table 5.3	Reaction rate constants of carbon loss without temperature correction $\frac{129}{124}$
Table 5.4	Temperature coefficients over time
Table 5.5	Reaction rate constants over time with temperature corrections <u>131</u>
Table 5.6	Residual Sum of Squares for two models used to compare reaction rate
T 11 67	constants over time
Table 5.7	Mean Residence Time of carbon
Table 5.8	Initial and final Carbon/Nitrogen ratios
Table 5.9	Time (days) required to achieve a C/N ratio of 20 in various trials 141
Table 5.10	Overall thermal inactivation coefficient for Total coliforms
Table 5.11	Overall thermal inactivation coefficient for Streptococci
Table 5.12	Thermal inactivation coefficient for Total coliforms
Table 5.13	Thermal inactivation coefficient for Streptococci
Table 5.14	Residual Sum of Squares (RSS) for two models used to compare therma
T.11. 5.15	inactivation coefficient for total Coliform over time
Table 5.15	Residual Sum of Squares for two models used to compare therma
T.11 516	inactivation coefficient for Streptococci over time
Table 5.16	Decimal reduction factor for Total coliforms
Table 5.17	Decimal reduction factor for Total coliforms <u>155</u>

Table		Page
Table 5.18	Decimal reduction factor for Streptococci	. 156
Table 5.19	Decimal reduction factor for Streptococci	. 156
	CHAPTER 6	
Table 6.1	Change in moisture content	. 168
Table 6.2	Residual Sum of Squares for moisture contents	
Table 6.3	Change in total solids	. 173
Table 6.4	Residual Sum of Squares for total solids	. 174
Table 6.5	Change in volatile	. 175
Table 6.6	Change in total nitrogen	. 178
Table 6.7	Residual Sum of Squares for total nitrogen	. 180
Table 6.8	Change in total phosphorus	. 181
Table 6.9	Residual Sum of Squares for total phosphorus	. 182
Table 6.10	Change in total organic carbon	. 183
Table 6.11	Residual Sum of Squares for total organic carbon	. 184
Table 6.12	Residual Sum of Squares for C/N ratios	. 186
Table 6.13	Change in pH	. 187
Table 6.14	Change in MPN	. 188
Table 6.15	Change in Streptococci counts	
Table 6.16	Residual Sum of Squares for microbial indicators	. 190
Table 6.17	Calculated F values and probability levels (5%) for different variab	les
		. 194

### LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
J	CHAPTER 2
Figure 2.1	The composting process
Figure 2.2	Temperature-time pattern indicating the phases of microbial activity
Figure 2.3	Generalised schematic for the composting process 34
C	. 0.
	CHAPTER 3
Figure 3.1	Schematic representation of the aeration piping layout used in the
	composting trials
Figure 3.2	Timer configuration for the 'on-off' regime of the aeration and the
	temperature measurement
Figure 3.3	Position of thermocouples and sampling points <u>61</u>
Figure 3.4	Schematic of the setup used for laboratory experiments
	CHAPTER 4
Figure 4.1	Temperature profile during composting in fourth trial at thermocouple
	positions T1 to T6
Figure 4.2	Changes in Total solids content during composting in fourth trial at
	positions S1 and S2
Figure 4.3	Changes in Volatile solids content during composting in fourth trial at
<b>D</b> : 4.4	positions S1 and S2
Figure 4.4	Changes in Total solids content during composting in experiment 6. 78
Figure 4.5	Changes in Total Solids content during composting in experiment 7. 79
Figure 4.6	Changes in Total Nitrogen contents during composting in fourth trial at
Figure 4.7	positions S1 and S2
Figure 4.7	Changes in Total nitrogen content during composting in experiment 6
Figure 4.8	Changes in Total nitrogen content during composting in experiment 7
rigule 4.6	85
Figure 4.9	Changes in Total Phosphorus contents during composting in fourth trial at
riguic 4.7	positions S1 and S2
Figure 4.10	Changes in Total phosphorus content during composting in experiment 6
riguie IIIo	90
Figure 4.11	Changes in Total phosphorus content during composting in experiment 7
8	91
Figure 4.12	Changes in Total Organic Carbon content during composting in fourth trial
8	at positions S1 and S2 94
Figure 4.13	Changes in Total Organic Carbon content during composting in experiment
C	6
Figure 4.14	Changes in Total Organic Carbon content during composting in experiment
-	7 96
Figure 4.15	Changes in pH values during composting in fourth trial at positions S1 and
	S2

Figure	Page
Figure 4.16	Changes in coliform (MPN) and streptococci counts during composting in fourth trial at positions S1
Figure 4.17	Changes in coliform (MPN) and streptococci counts during composting in fourth trial at positions S2
Figure 4.18	Changes in total coliform (MPN) during composting in experiment 6
Figure 4.19	Changes in faecal coliform (MPN) during composting in experiment 6
Figure 4.20 Figure 4.21	Changes in <i>E.coli</i> (MPN) during composting in experiment 6 <u>108</u> Changes in enterococci numbers during composting in experiment 6
Figure 4.22	Changes in total coliforms (MPN) during composting in experiment 7
Figure 4.23	Changes in faecal coliforms (MPN) during composting in experiment 7
	<u>111</u>
	CHAPTER 5
Figure 5.1	Best fit curve to calculate parameter values for Eq. 5.8 at S1 in Trial 1
Figure 5.2	Best fit curve to calculate parameter values for Eq. 5.8 at S2 in Trial 1
Figure 5.3 Figure 6.1	Survival of Total coliform at different controlled temperatures $\frac{132}{158}$ Two parallel lines fitted to x and $y_1 \& y_2$ values $\frac{165}{165}$
	CHAPTER 7
Figure 7.1	Roofed aerated composting facility at Lepperton Piggery
Figure 7.2	Piggery compost at curing stage