



Faculty of Health, Engineering and Sciences

**Optimising nutrient extraction from chicken manure and
compost**

For the award of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

A dissertation submitted by

Abdalkhkim Mohamed A. Ksheem

2014

To my Mother and Father,
To my Sisters Salma and Ahlam,
To my Brothers Khaled, Adel, Mahmoud and Naserdeen,
To my Wife Marwa,
To my Children Safa and Daina,
To each who taught me goodness and humanity,
To each who instilled in me the meaning of hope and humanitarian
highness,
To each who helped me,
I dedicate this work.

Abdalkhalek Mohamed A. Ksheem

USQ, Queensland, Australia.

Abstract

The global production of chicken manure is estimated to be 457 million tonnes per year. Chicken manure contains most nutrients that could be applied as a fertiliser to plants. Chicken manure has a high salinity level, high nitrogen and phosphorus content, low C/N ratio and contains pathogens. Hence, the disposal of chicken manure requires appropriate management to avoid environmental contamination. The main disposal practices are direct application to agricultural lands or composting. However, both of these methods require a high standard of management. This research investigates strategies for optimising nutrient extraction by leaching chicken waste. If the leachate can be extracted and treated effectively, then it may be applied to crops using an irrigation system where the rate and time of application are more readily controlled.

There are a range of methods used to extract soluble nutrients from animal manure at different scales. The main nutrient extraction methods produce either a manure leachate or manure tea. However, the quality (both nutrient and pathogen levels) of the leachate or tea is a function of the waste material properties and the extraction method used. Hence, the aim of this research was to identify strategies which optimised the extraction of the soluble nutrients from chicken manure or compost.

Fresh chicken manure and compost (ranging in age from 1 to 18 weeks) was packed into small columns which were subsequently leached. The leachate extracted from fresh manure and week 1 compost was found to contain higher concentrations of soluble nutrients than leachate derived from the week 6 and 18 composts. However, the leachate from the fresh manure also contained high levels of sodium and the leachate from both fresh manure and the young composts contained pathogens. On the other hand, leachate extracted from the older composts (≥ 4 weeks old) was free of pathogens. Further column studies were conducted to (a) evaluate the effect of column length and packing density on the nutrient extraction, (b) identify strategies for eliminating pathogens in the leachate and (c) evaluate the effect of increasing the hydraulic pressure in the extraction process. In general, the concentration of soluble nutrients in the leachate was found to increase with both column length and packing density. To evaluate the sterilisation options, a range of treatments (hot water, acetic acid and hydrogen peroxide) were applied during leaching and different treatments (acetic acid, hydrogen peroxide, heating and ozone) were applied to the extracted leachate. The most effective treatments were found to involve leaching with hot water (although the concentration of soluble nutrients was greatly reduced) or applying ozone to the extracted leachate (which did not affect the nutrient levels). While the application of a low hydraulic pressure during leaching reduced the time required to extract nutrients the concentration of soluble nutrients per unit volume of leachate was reduced due to a reduced contact time.

This work has identified the effect of the waste material properties and extraction methodology on nutrients in the leachate. However, further work is required to (a) better understand the optimal column length to packing density ratio and the extraction pressure appropriate for specific waste materials, (b) evaluate strategies to mitigate the potential effect of high sodium levels found in the leachate, (c) evaluate the efficacy of

nutrient extraction improvements, including the use of a recirculating leaching system, and (d) refine the nutrient extraction system design for commercial scale use.

Certification of Dissertation

I certify that the ideas, experimental work, analyses, results, and conclusions reported in this dissertation are my own work, except where otherwise specified acknowledged. I further certify that this work is original and has not been previously submitted for any another award, except where otherwise acknowledged.

Endorsement:

Abdihakim Mohamed A. Ksheem

Date

Professor Steven Raine, Principal Supervisor

Date

Dr John McLean Bennett, Co- Supervisor

Date

Acknowledgment

I wish to express my thanks to those people who have supported and helped me during my study. Firstly, my sincere thanks to my supervisors Professor Steven Raine and Dr John McLean Bennett for supervising me and for their patience and guidance during my study. I sincerely thank them for their support and encouragement of me, especial during the bad circumstances that my country Libya faced during 2011. Also, I thank them for their technical assistance and expert advice.

I wish to greatly acknowledge the support of Tripoli University, the Libyan Government, for providing funding for a full scholarship and the National Centre of Engineering Agriculture (NCEA) for providing me further operational funding to support my research.

A special thanks to the NCEA staff for their support of me, I am thankful to Dr Pam Pittaway for her valuable discussions and assistance regarding composting and chicken manure analysis; and, to both Dr Dio Antille and Dr Lindsay Henderson for their help in undertaking some editing. I also appreciate the support provided by Professor Dan Sullivan at the Oregon State University and Professor Abdullah Sasi at The University of Tripoli for their valuable advice.

Also, I am thankful to the lovely staff in the Faculty of Health, Engineering and Sciences, USQ. A special thanks to Dr Friederike Eberhard and Mr Raed Ahmed for their support in the waste water Laboratory. Also, I am thankful to all my friends and colleagues at USQ, especially Jamal Fernana and Emohamed Maryol for their encouragement and support. Finally I would like to thank my father, mother, brothers, wife and children for their encouragement and support during my study.

Table of Contents

Abstract	I
Certification of Dissertation	III
Acknowledgment	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Figures	X
List of Tables.....	XIII
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	XIV
1 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Structure of thesis	3
2 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Chicken manure composition	5
2.3 Chicken waste disposal	6
2.3.1 Application of chicken manure to agricultural lands	6
2.3.2 Composting chicken manure.....	7
2.4 Application methods of chicken manure	9
2.4.1 Application of solid manure materials	9
2.4.2 Application of waste in a slurry or liquid form.....	10
2.5 Extraction of soluble nutrients from waste material	11
2.5.1 Anaerobic “passive” system.....	11
2.5.2 Aerobic “Bucket-bubble method” system.....	12
2.5.3 Manure/Compost leachate.....	12
2.6 Effects of applying chicken manure on soil	12
2.6.1 Physical soil properties	13
2.6.2 Chemical soil properties.....	13
2.6.3 Biological soil properties	14
2.7 Chicken manure risk for human health	15
2.8 Summary and hypothesis.....	16
2.9 Research significance and specific objectives.....	16
3 CHAPTER 3: GENERAL METHODOLOGY	18
3.1 Introduction	18
3.2 Collection of manure and compost samples.....	18
3.3 Physical, chemical and biological properties of chicken manure and compost.....	19

3.3.1	Moisture content.....	19
3.3.2	Bulk density and particle density	20
3.3.3	Porosity and total pore volume.....	21
3.3.4	Total Carbon and Nitrogen.....	21
3.3.5	Inorganic elements in material	21
3.3.6	Electrical conductivity (EC), pH and soluble elements	21
3.3.7	Cation exchange capacity (CEC)	22
3.3.8	Exchangeable cations	22
3.3.9	Pathogens	22
3.4	Characteristic of chicken manure/compost leachate	24
3.4.1	Measurement of soluble nutrients in leachate	24
3.4.2	Pathogens in leachate	24
4	CHAPTER 4: PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF LEACHATE FROM CHICKEN WASTE	26
4.1	Introduction	26
4.2	Methodology.....	27
4.2.1	Description of compost samples	27
4.2.2	Column preparation and leaching	27
4.2.3	Statistical analyses.....	28
4.3	Results	28
4.3.1	Manure and compost properties	28
4.3.2	Leachate electrical conductivity (EC) and pH	28
4.3.3	Macronutrients in leachate	29
4.3.4	Pathogens in leachate	34
4.4	Discussion.....	35
4.4.1	Effect of compost age and nutrient in leachate	35
4.4.2	Effects of compost age on pathogens in leachate.....	35
4.4.3	Effect of extraction volume on leachate.....	36
4.5	Conclusion.....	36
5	CHAPTER 5: FACTORS AFFECTING NUTRIENT EXTRACTION FROM CHICKEN WASTE	37
5.1	Introduction	37
5.2	Materials and Methods	38
5.2.1	Manure and compost sampling	38
5.2.2	Chemical and physical properties	38
5.2.3	Column preparation and extraction of soluble nutrients	38

5.2.4	Saturated hydraulic conductivity and collection of leachate	38
5.2.5	Experimental design and statistical analyses	39
5.3	Results	39
5.3.1	Chemical and physical properties of chicken waste materials.....	39
5.3.2	Effects of compost packing density and column length on hydraulic conductivity.....	40
5.3.3	Effect of bulk density and column length on total dissolved salts.....	41
5.3.4	Effects of bulk density and column length on ions extraction.....	43
5.3.5	Cation ratio of soil stability (CROSS)	51
5.4	Discussion	52
5.4.1	Comparison of fresh manure and mature compost leachates.....	52
5.4.2	Selection of the optimum column length and packing density	53
5.4.3	Treatment of leachates for CROSS	54
5.5	Conclusions	56
6	CHAPTER 6: CONTROLLING PATHOGENS IN CHICKEN WASTE LEACHATE.....	57
6.1	Introduction	57
6.2	Materials and methods.....	58
6.2.1	Manure and compost sampling	58
6.2.2	Chemical and physical properties of manure	58
6.2.3	Column preparation and extraction of soluble nutrients	58
6.2.4	Description of the sterilisation treatments	58
6.2.5	Leachate properties	60
6.2.6	Experimental design and statistical analyses	60
6.3	Results	60
6.3.1	Pathogen control.....	60
6.3.2	Soluble ions extraction.....	62
6.3.3	Cation ratio of structural stability	67
6.4	Discussion	68
6.4.1	Effects of treatments on pathogen control	68
6.4.2	Effect of treatments on leachate nutrient composition.....	69
6.5	Conclusion.....	70
7	CHAPTER 7: EVALUATION OF INCREASING LEACHING SOLUTION PRESSURE IN AN INITIAL NUTRIENT EXTRACTION SYSTEM FOR CHICKEN WASTE	71
7.1	Introduction	71
7.2	Material and methods	72

7.2.1	Manure and compost sampling	72
7.2.2	Chemical and physical properties	72
7.2.3	Column preparation and extraction of soluble nutrients	72
7.2.4	Pressure treatments, system construction and leachate collection	72
7.2.5	Elimination of pathogens	73
7.2.6	Characteristics of leachate.....	73
7.2.7	Summary of experimental design and statistical analyses	74
7.3	Results	74
7.3.1	Effects of pressure levels on pH and total dissolved salts (TDS)	74
7.3.2	Effects of pressure on soluble nutrients	75
7.3.3	Sodium and Chloride.....	77
7.3.4	Temperature of water and leachate	78
7.3.5	Cation Ratio of Soil Structural Stability (CROSS)	78
7.3.6	Pathogens in leachate	79
7.4	Discussion.....	80
7.4.1	Effect of pressure on nutrient extracted	80
7.4.2	Preliminary analysis of system viability	81
7.5	Limitations and future directions.....	82
7.6	Conclusion.....	82
8	CHAPTER 8: GENERAL DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK.....	84
8.1	General discussion.....	84
8.1.1	The viability of using fresh chicken manure or mature compost as a source of soluble nutrients to produce liquid organic fertiliser.....	84
8.1.2	Optimising nutrient extraction for manure and compost	86
8.1.3	Approaching the design of a nutrient extraction system for irrigation purposes.....	88
8.2	General conclusion	89
8.3	Future work direction	89
	References	92
	Appendix A: Additional Preliminary Trial for Chapter 6	105
	Appendix A.1: Identifying the appropriate hot water temperature to eliminate pathogens.....	105
	A.1.1 Introduction	105
	A.1.2 Measurements and treatments	105
	A.1.3 Results	105

8.4	Appendix A.2: Identifying the appropriate period of ozone application to eliminate pathogens.....	106
	A.2.1 Introduction	106
	A.2.2 Measurements and treatments	106
	A.2.3 Results	106
9	Glossary	108

List of Figures

Figure 1-1 Thesis outline and structure	4
Figure 3-1 Evolution of temperature inside compost pile during composting process. Bars on plotted are standard error of three replicate	19
Figure 3-2 SUNTEX colony counter	24
Figure 4-1 Effect of compost maturity and water application on leachate (a) pH and (b) cumulative total dissolved salts (TDS) extracted from chicken waste. Bars on plotted are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare water applied within each compost age.	29
Figure 4-2 Effect of compost maturity and water applied on cumulative (a) total dissolved nitrogen TDN, (b) nitrite and (c) nitrate in compost leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.	31
Figure 4-3 Effect of compost maturity and water applied on cumulative soluble phosphate in leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.	32
Figure 4-4 Effect of compost maturity and water applied on cumulative soluble potassium (K) in leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.	33
Figure 4-5 Effect of compost maturity and water application on cumulative (a) sodium, and (b) chloride in leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.	33
Figure 4-6 Effect of compost maturity and water applied on cation ratio of soil stability of leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.....	34
Figure 4-7 Effect of compost maturity and water applied on number of colonies of (a) E coli, and (b) Salmonella spp in leachate extracted from chicken waste. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) to compare between leaching events for each compost age.	35
Figure 5-1 The effect of packing density of chicken manure on saturated hydraulic conductivity in (a) 50 mm column and (b) 100 mm columns of fresh manure, and (c) 50 mm and (d) 100 mm columns of mature compost. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing water applied for all packing density.	42
Figure 5-2 The effect of packing density on cumulative total dissolved salts (TDS) extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each packing density.....	43
Figure 5-3 The effect of packing density on cumulative total dissolved nitrogen (TDN) extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm column, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm column. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each packing density.....	44
Figure 5-4 Effect of column length and packing density on leaching efficiency index for total dissolved nitrogen in (a) fresh manure and (b) mature compost. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing with treatments.....	45
Figure 5-5 The effect of packing density on cumulative soluble phosphorus extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each packing density.	46

Figure 5-6 Effect of column length and packing density on leaching efficiency index for soluble phosphorus in (a) fresh manure and (b) mature compost. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing within treatments.	47
Figure 5-7 The effect of packing density on cumulative soluble potassium extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each bulk density. 48	48
Figure 5-8 Effect of column length and packing density on leaching efficiency index of soluble potassium in (a) fresh manure and (b) mature compost. Bars are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing within treatments.	49
Figure 5-9 The effect of packing density on cumulative soluble sodium extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each bulk density. 50	50
Figure 5-10 The effect of packing density on cumulative soluble chloride extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each bulk density. 51	51
Figure 5-11 The effect of packing density on leachate CROSS extracted from chicken manure in (a) 50 mm and (b) 100 mm columns, and mature compost in (c) 50 mm column and (d) 100 mm columns. Bars are LSD ($\alpha = 0.05$) comparing water applied for each bulk density.	52
Figure 5-12 The effect of fractionating on SAR in (a) fresh manure leachate (b) mature compost leachate and nutrients in fresh manure leachate (c) before and (d) after partition, and nutrients in manure compost leachate (e) before and (f) after partition.	55
Figure 6-1. Effect of extraction solution on (a) E coli and (b) Salmonella spp in manure leachate. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing solutions extraction at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing within treatments.	61
Figure 6-2 The effect of leaching chicken manure column by different sterilisation solutions on (a) total dissolved nitrogen and (b) leachate pH. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing treatments at respective pore volumes. Bars on line plots are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing volumes with each treatment.	63
Figure 6-3 The effect of leaching chicken manure columns with different sterilisation solutions on (a) total dissolved nitrogen (b) soluble phosphorus and (c) soluble potassium. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing treatments at respective pore volume. Bars on line plots are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing volume within each treatment.	64
Figure 6-4 The effect of leaching chicken manure column by different solutions on (a) soluble Ca and (b) soluble Mg. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing treatment at respective pore volumes. Bars on line plots are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing volume within each treatment.	65
Figure 6-5 The effect on soluble nutrients of applying different sterilisation treatments to chicken manure leachate. Bars on plotted are standard error for each nutrient.	66
Figure 6-6 The effect on soluble nutrients of applying different sterilisation treatments to chicken manure leachate. Bars on plotted are standard error for each nutrient.	66
Figure 6-7 The effect of leaching chicken manure column by different sterilisation solutions on sodium adsorption ratio. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing treatments at respective pore volume. Bars on line plots are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing volume within each treatment.	67
Figure 7-1 The schematic design for extraction of soluble nutrients from chicken fresh manure using pressure	73

Figure 7-2 The effects of different pressure levels on (a) pH and (b) total dissolved salts (TDS). Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing pressure levels at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing variability within treatments.75

Figure 7-3 The effects of different pressure level on (a) Total dissolved nitrogen, (b) soluble P and (c) Soluble K. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing pressure levels at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing variation within treatment.....76

Figure 7-4 The effects of different pressure level on (a) Soluble Ca and (b) soluble Mg. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing pressure levels at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing variation within treatment.77

Figure 7-5 The effects of different pressure level on (a) Soluble Na and (b) soluble Cl. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing pressure levels at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing variation within treatment.78

Figure 7-6 The effects of different pressure level on CROSS of leachate. Bars at top of graph are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing pressure levels at respective pore volume. Bars on plotted lines are LSD ($\alpha=0.05$) comparing variation wihtin treatment.79

List of Tables

Table 1-1 Typical physical and chemical properties of chicken manure*	1
Table 2-1 Estimated quantities of excreta and nutrient outputs at the end of housing period*	5
Table 2-2 Average concentrations of mineral nutrients in plant shoot dry matter that are sufficient for adequate growth*	6
Table 4-1 Chemical, biological and physical properties of fresh chicken manure and compost	28
Table 5-1 The amount of water applied per unit of mass of chicken waste ($\text{cm}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$ dry matter) for each column length and packing density.	39
Table 5-2 Selected properties of chicken waste*	40
Table 5-3 Reduction in cation ratio of soil stability after applying gypsum to the leachate derived from chicken manure by using bulk density 0.4 g cm^{-3} and 100 mm column length.	56
Table 6-1 Some selected chicken fresh manure characteristics	59
Table 6-2 The effect of post-sterilising treatment on the number of pathogens in chicken manure leachate	62
Table 7-2 The number of pathogens in leachates extracted by different pressure levels	79

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	Atomic Absorption Spectrometer
ANOVA	Analysis of variance
C	Carbon
C/N	Carbon to nitrogen ratio
Ca	Calcium
°C	Degree Celsius
CO ₂	Carbon dioxide
Cl	Chloride
CROSS	Cation Ratio of Soil Stability
DM	Dry mass
dS m ⁻¹	Decisiemens per meter
EC	Electrical Conductivity
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
K	Potassium
KCl	Potassium Chloride
Ksat	Saturated Hydraulic conductivity
LSD	Least Significant Difference
Mg	Magnesium
N	Nitrogen
Na	Sodium
NO ₃	Nitrate
NO ₂	Nitrite
P	Phosphorus
SOM	Soil Organic Matter
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture