# Long Term Nitrogen Management in Bioreactor Landfills

Dr. Morton A. Barlaz, NC State Univ., Raleigh, NC, USA, <u>barlaz@eos.ncsu.edu</u> Gary R. Hater, Waste Management Inc., Cincinnati, OH, <u>ghater@wm.com</u>

#### **Introduction and Objectives**

Landfill leachate typically contains high concentrations of ammonia-nitrogen long after it is stable with respect to both organic and metal concentrations. Thus, the removal of ammonia from landfill leachate will be a factor in determining when an overall landfill can be considered stable. One scenario for ammonia removal is the aerobic treatment of leachate outside of the landfill to convert ammonia to NO<sub>3</sub>, followed by use of the landfill as an anaerobic bioreactor for the conversion of NO<sub>3</sub> to N<sub>2</sub>. The objective of this research was to develop an understanding of the nitrogen cycle in landfills sufficient to develop a long-term strategy for the management of nitrogen in landfill leachate. Specific questions include (1) How much nitrate-nitrogen (NO<sub>3</sub>-N) can be added to refuse in various states of decomposition without adversely affecting the ability of the refuse to resume methanogenesis after NO<sub>3</sub> depletion?, (2) Do denitrification reactions result in an inhibitory pH increase?, (3) Are there conditions under which NO<sub>3</sub> addition to landfills would lead to the production of ammonium (NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>) in place of N<sub>2</sub> by dissimilatory NO<sub>3</sub> reduction to ammonium (DNRA)?, and (4) What types of organic carbon and what concentrations are required to support denitrification in landfills?

#### **Experimental Design**

Nine reactors (1-9) were filled with a mixture of fresh and old refuse to evaluate the extent of  $NO_3$  consumption and the effect of  $NO_3$  addition on  $CH_4$  production, leachate pH and  $N_2O$  production. The old refuse served as a seed to initiate  $CH_4$  production. The reactors were operated until they reached an approximate peak in  $CH_4$  production at which time  $NO_3$  was added to eight of nine reactors (1-6, 8-9) while the ninth reactor (7) served as the control. This first set of  $NO_3$  additions will be referred to as Phase 1  $NO_3$  additions. In these reactors, sufficient  $NO_3$  was added every other day to increase the leachate concentration by 400 mg  $NO_3$ -N/L in each reactor.

In the Phase 2 NO<sub>3</sub> addition regime, NO<sub>3</sub> was added to 3 of 9 reactors (1, 6, 8) to measure the denitrification potential in well-decomposed refuse as defined by a relatively low CH<sub>4</sub> production rate. Initially, NO<sub>3</sub> was added to the decomposed refuse. Next, high concentrations of degradable organic carbon in the form of acetate were added to selected reactors along with low concentrations of NO<sub>3</sub> to evaluate whether ammonia was produced by DNRA. Next, a humic acid solution was added along with NO<sub>3</sub> to evaluate whether it can serve as an electron donor to support denitrification. Finally, the top 25 % of the refuse in reactor 1 was replaced with fresh refuse, which simulated the placement of a layer of fresh refuse over well decomposed refuse. Nitrate was then added 3 times to evaluate whether the organic carbon from the fresh refuse could support denitrification.

#### **Results:** Phase 1 - Denitrification During Active Methane Production

The refuse ecosystem exhibited strong capacity to consume  $NO_3$  when added at 400 mg-N/L to actively decomposing refuse. As expected,  $CH_4$  production was inhibited when  $NO_3$  was added and the  $CH_4$  recovery time after cessation of  $NO_3$  addition was generally proportional

to the duration of the NO<sub>3</sub> addition, which varied from 19 to 59 days. The CH<sub>4</sub> production recovery times suggest that methanogens were inhibited but not killed by the high NO<sub>3</sub> additions. The Phase 1 CH<sub>4</sub> yields were inversely proportional to the mass of NO<sub>3</sub> added, which is consistent with the diversion of the carbon substrate from the reduction of CO<sub>2</sub> to CH<sub>4</sub> to the reduction of NO<sub>3</sub> to N<sub>2</sub>. Towards the end of the NO<sub>3</sub> addition regime, when refuse decomposition was advanced, NO<sub>3</sub> consumption rates decreased such that not all NO<sub>3</sub> was consumed in 48 hr. Reduced NO<sub>3</sub> depletion rates corresponded with the lowest measured COD concentration in a reactor, suggesting that the decrease in available organic was the reason why NO<sub>3</sub> depletion slowed down in these reactors. Total N recovery ranged from 95 to 106% of the added NO<sub>3</sub>-N. While most of the added NO<sub>3</sub> was recovered as N<sub>2</sub>(89.5 to 101.2%), 2.3 – 11.7% was recovered as N<sub>2</sub>O. This amount is expected to be above the upper limit of what would occur in a full-scale landfill where there would be longer retention times, allowing for more complete reduction of N<sub>2</sub>O to N<sub>2</sub>.

### **Results:** Phase 2 - Denitrification in Well Decomposed Refuse

In decomposed refuse with relatively low  $CH_4$  production rates, the depletion of  $NO_3$  required 5 - 15 days and this period of slow  $NO_3$  depletion corresponded with lower BOD and COD concentrations relative to Phase 1. The addition of excess acetate stimulated  $NO_3$  depletion and resulted in a significant increase in BOD. Even after acetate additions ceased,  $NO_3$  was rapidly consumed until the excess acetate had been depleted, which corresponded with a decrease in BOD. Nitrate depletion was also stimulated by removing the top 25% of the well-decomposed refuse and replacing it with fresh refuse. This simulated the addition of fresh refuse to the top layers of a landfill. Nitrate depletion was not stimulated by humic acid addition. Thus, the results of the acetate, humic acid and fresh refuse addition are consistent in showing that degradable organic carbon limits the rate of  $NO_3$  depletion in decomposed refuse.

The addition of a high ratio of degradable organic carbon to  $NO_3$  did not appear to lead to the production of ammonia by DNRA which is good as ammonia production would be counterproductive in landfills. A possible explanation is that a significant portion of the added carbon was consumed by methanogens. Methane production was inhibited but did not cease when  $NO_3$  was added. Therefore, it is possible that the  $NO_3$  reducing bacteria were exposed to a lower electron donor/electron acceptor ratio than that which was added to the reactors.

## Summary

Methane production rates were inhibited while the refuse was exposed to high concentrations of NO<sub>3</sub>, but rates recovered after NO<sub>3</sub> addition was terminated. Thus, it would appear that the use of a landfill as a bioreactor in which NO<sub>3</sub>-rich leachate is recirculated for conversion to N<sub>2</sub> gas is viable, and denitrification will not adversely upset the landfill ecosystem in a manner from which it cannot recover. From a field-scale perspective, the results suggest that NO<sub>3</sub> addition can be expected to most completely reduce  $CH_4$  production closest to the point of injection. Given the capacity of refuse to rapidly consume NO<sub>3</sub>, it is unlikely that  $CH_4$  production in the deeper sections of the landfill will be affected. This has implications for the emissions of uncollected  $CH_4$ , which likely originate near the landfill surface.