

Vermiculture: a potential role in the management of broiler litter in Australia?

James Turnell
B.Nat.Res.(Hons)

Submitted: 18/06/2007

A thesis submitted for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Abstract

With increasing human population, the demand for quality animal meat products is increasing, and intensive chicken meat (broiler) production is contributing to some of this demand. A major output from commercial farms is broiler litter (litter) which has relatively high plant nutrient concentrations compared to other animal manures. This makes litter valuable for plant production and hence it is mainly utilised and disposed of on land. However, the suitability of land within cost effective distances from growers is becoming an increasing problem worldwide, with reduced suitability due to potential environmental and bio-security risks. Therefore it is important to develop disposal mechanisms that can provide the industry with an alternative to the direct land application of litter. The present research was undertaken to gain an understanding of the potential role vermiculture could have in the management of litter in Australia.

Vermiculture has the potential to produce both humic rich vermi-compost (vermicast) and meat-meal (vermimeal) from litter. Traditionally vermiculture has primarily been adopted to produce vermicast, a recognised valuable organic fertiliser. However, the production and processing of earthworms into vermimeal is becoming an increasingly viable component. Both of these outputs potentially render vermiculture a value-adding opportunity for the Australian poultry industry, whilst providing an alternative disposal option for litter. That being said vermiculturalists have tended to avoid nutrient rich or 'hot' wastes due the system becoming unstable, resulting in earthworm mortality. Uniquely, this research focused on using fresh litter as the sole food source for earthworms (*Eisenia andrei*) in a batch flow system.

There were three components to this study; firstly defining the litter resource for vermiculture, with a comparison between two integrated broiler processing companies (integrators). Secondly, five laboratory experiments were undertaken to determine if the vermiculture system could operate on fresh litter, and if so at what rate earthworms would process the litter. Thirdly, once the laboratory experiments had been refined a field scale trial was conducted, which used an average commercial shed's worth of litter (70 m³).

In the first study, the concentrations and variability of chemicals in litter from several farms associated with two Australian integrators were investigated, for suitability of the litter as a food source for earthworms. Previous research had shown that chemical concentrations within litter were highly variable (Marshall et al. 2000, Moore et al. 2000). In contrast this study suggested that the variability in litter from modern evaporative-cooled tunnel ventilated sheds was low. For example, Nitrogen (N) concentrations in litter from three growers operating in Queensland were

Abstract

between 20 and 25 g/kg. Also, the highest within farm variation for N from all farms sampled was 18 % coefficient of variation (cv). The consistency of the litter resource between and within broiler growers indicated that if a vermiculture system could be designed to use fresh litter, then earthworm responses should be similar from one batch of litter to the next.

Secondly, laboratory experiments were designed using an inverted batch flow vermiculture system utilising fresh litter and coconut husk earthworm bedding. Data on earthworm health was also collected using unique health parameters including the dispersion of earthworms on the surface of their bedding (dispersion score) and the rate at which they retracted into their bedding (retraction rate). From previous attempts at using litter it was evident that earthworms were more likely to die when they bunched on the surface (high dispersion score), and when they retracted slowly into their bedding. These health parameters provided a prediction of when mortality was most likely, which enabled management decisions to be made before the system completely failed.

The first three laboratory experiments investigated N management. The first experiment focused on the application and timing of water to improve earthworm health and litter conversion. Results indicated that watering twice daily was ideal in maximising litter conversion and reducing earthworm mortality. Treatments receiving regular watering had lower dispersion scores and faster retraction rates, compared to treatments with extended periods between watering. For example, when decreasing water applications from twice a day to every four days average retraction rates increased from 7.9 to 23.4 seconds. Experiment 2 (ceasing water) indicated that the system was most unstable during the first 8 days and did not require large water applications for the remaining duration of the process. This raised questions about the chemistry of bedding and leachate between stressed and non-stressed systems, which was the focus of experiment 3.

The third experiment investigated changes in total N (TN), electrical conductivity (EC), pH and ammonium (NH_4^+). Measurements were taken from both earthworm bedding and leachate when earthworms were stressed. Total N concentration in earthworm bedding increased during the first five days from 7 to 20 g/kg. More importantly was the 50% lower EC in the least stressed treatment (S1) on day 5 when higher stressed treatments were terminated, due to earthworm mortality exceeding 75%. Furthermore, the heavier the water application the greater the volume of leachate produced and the more NH_4^+ removed. Heavy initial water applications were the most likely factor contributing to system stabilisation. At this stage in the research an attempt was made to use vermicast derived from litter for earthworm bedding, as it would be available on-site and could improve the economic viability of the system.

The final two laboratory experiments focused on using vermicast earthworm bedding, and included using inoculants supplied by a commercial vermiculturalist in an attempt to improve productivity. Results from experiment 4 indicated that the harvest of earthworms increased from 200 to 400 g and litter conversion time almost halved by using vermicast bedding instead of coconut husk. This outcome was an important finding from a commercial perspective, since an external bedding source (coconut husk) was not required to process litter. Additional chemical analysis of both coconut husk and vermicast bedding indicated that N fluctuated considerably over 24 hours between watering events, again highlighting the importance of regular watering. It was also evident that the EC of leachate increased to above 30 dS/m on day 10 and then decreased to 6 dS/m by completion. This initial spike in EC was evidence that salts including NH_4^+ were the most likely cause of earthworm mortality during the early stages of the process. In the final laboratory experiment inoculation of earthworm substrate was investigated. Although it was expected that by increasing microbial populations in the litter the system would stabilise faster, results from experiment 5 suggested inoculant did not improve the rate of litter conversion or the biomass of earthworms.

Finally, a field trial was conducted using a full commercial shed load of litter (70 m^3) as an input for a batch flow vermiculture system. This litter was successfully converted into vermicast within 108 days and an estimated 2000-4000 kg of earthworms were available for harvest. Combining the field trial results with those conducted in the laboratory, enabled the development of a model for the broiler industry to determine the potential outputs from this system, and its value-adding potential. Based on the vermiculture process operating at optimum conditions it was not unreasonable to assume that from 70 m^3 of litter, approximately $44\text{-}52 \text{ m}^3$ of vermicast and 9,450 kg of earthworms could be sold off-site. The results so far are most encouraging.

Acknowledgments

This study would not have been possible without the support and funding Australian Poultry CRC and Mr Wayne Fauser (Thewormman®). I truly appreciate their assistance, guidance and enthusiasm in solving the hurdles encountered throughout the project. I would also like to thank my two wonderful supervisors, Associate Professor Richard Faulkner and Associate Professor Geoff Hinch, who were always there. I would like to thank Dr Simon Murray, who was initially my supervisor, and kept me focused on timelines. I am grateful for the technical assistance from School of Environmental Science and Natural Resource Management and the School of Rural Science and Agriculture. I especially acknowledge the technical help from Marion Costigan, Leanne Lisle, Barbara Gorham and the computing support from Jim O'Neill.

I would like to express my gratitude to Milton Curkpatrick and Peter Robinson of UNE Rural Properties for allowing access to Laureldale Research Station and providing fencing for the field trial. Thank you to the broiler integrators for organising litter for my experiments and collaborating with me to undertake sampling. I sincerely thank Adam Downey and Nic Rodgers, former PhD students for their help and encouragement, especially regarding statistical advice. A very kind thankyou to current and previous participants of our poultry research group at UNE, their support has been wonderful.

A special thankyou to my lovely wife Janelle Wilkes, who supported me when I needed it most and encouraged me to trust my instincts. I would also like to thank my parents and extended family for finding the time to listen, thankyou.

Table of contents

1.	Introduction	1
1.1	Poultry Waste Management	1
2.	Literature review	5
2.1	Introduction	5
2.2	The Australian poultry industry	6
2.2.1	Litter and other poultry wastes	7
2.3	Benefits of litter to agriculture	12
2.3.1	Plant production in Australia	12
2.3.2	Nitrogen	12
2.3.3	Phosphorus	13
2.3.4	Organic matter	14
2.4	Environmental concerns with land application of animal wastes	15
2.4.1	Hydrological losses	16
2.4.2	Trace element accumulation in soils	20
2.4.3	Greenhouse gas emissions and atmospheric pollution	22
2.4.4	Regulations on litter end-users	22
2.5	Current value-adding technologies and closed loop systems	24
2.5.1	Composting	25
2.5.2	Waste-to-energy	27
2.5.3	Charring, pelletisation and carbon sequestration	29
2.6	Value-adding to litter using vermiculture	29
2.6.1	Earthworm species and their role in the ecosystem	30
2.6.2	Earthworm substrates and feeding approaches	31
2.6.3	Physiology and management of earthworms	32
2.6.4	Substrate ecology	35
2.6.5	Casts and vermicast	36
2.6.6	Vermimeal	37
2.6.7	Pathogen control	39
2.6.8	Implications for adopting vermiculture by the poultry industry	39
2.7	Conclusion	41
3.	Variability in litter composition and its implication for vermiculture	43
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Methods	44
3.3	Results	46

Table of contents

3.4	Discussion.....	48
4.	Laboratory experiments- N management.....	51
4.1	Introduction.....	51
4.2	Methods.....	53
4.2.1	Establishment of mini-vermiculture systems.....	53
4.2.2	Measurements of earthworm stress and health.....	54
4.2.3	Conversion measurements.....	55
4.2.4	Methods for experiments 1 and 2 (application, timing and ceasing water).....	56
4.2.5	Methods for experiment 3 (earthworm stress and N).....	58
4.3	Results.....	60
4.3.1	Experiment 1 (application and timing).....	60
4.3.2	Experiment 2 (ceasing water).....	63
4.3.3	Experiment 3 (earthworm stress and N).....	66
4.4	Discussion.....	69
4.4.1	Experiment 1 (application and timing).....	69
4.4.2	Experiment 2 (ceasing water).....	71
4.4.3	Experiment 3 (earthworm stress and N).....	71
5.	Laboratory experiments- vermicast bedding and inoculation.....	75
5.1	Introduction.....	75
5.2	Methods.....	76
5.2.1	Experiment 4 (vermicast bedding).....	76
5.2.2	Experiment 5 (inoculated bedding).....	77
5.3	Results.....	79
5.3.1	Experiment 4 (vermicast bedding).....	79
5.3.2	Experiment 5 (inoculated bedding).....	86
5.4	Discussion.....	89
5.4.1	Experiment 4 (vermicast bedding).....	89
5.4.2	Experiment 5 (inoculated bedding).....	92
6.	Field vermiculture trial.....	95
6.1	Introduction.....	95
6.2	Methods.....	97
6.2.1	Introduction.....	97
6.2.2	Site description and climate.....	97
6.2.3	Earthworm recruitment and bedding (vermicast).....	99
6.2.4	Commercial vermiculture beds.....	101
6.3	Results.....	105
6.4	Discussion.....	108
6.5	Model.....	113

6.5.1	Laboratory experiment model (effect due to water interval)	113
6.5.2	Laboratory experiment model (less than optimum)	114
6.5.3	Laboratory experiment model (optimum)	115
6.5.4	Commercial field scale model (based on half a shed)	116
7.	Conclusion	119
	References	123
	Appendix A	xxiv
	Statistical analysis for variability in litter	xxiv
	Statistical analysis for Figure 3.1	xxiv
	Statistical analysis for Figure 3.2	xxv
	Statistical analysis for Table 3.2	xxvii
	Appendix B	xxix
	Standard errors for variability in litter	xxix
	Appendix C	xxx
	Standard errors for laboratory experiments	xxx
	Experiment 1	xxx
	SE for Table 4.4	xxx
	Experiment 2	xxx
	SE for Table 4.5	xxx
	SE for Table 4.6	xxx
	Experiment 3	xxx
	SE for Table 4.7	xxx
	SE for Table 4.8	xxx
	Experiment 4	xxx
	SE for Table 5.3	xxx
	Experiment 5	xxx
	SE for Table 5.4	xxx
	Appendix D	xxxii
	Statistical analysis for laboratory experiments	xxxii
	Experiment 1	xxxii
	Statistical analysis for Figure 4.6	xxxii
	Statistical analysis for Figure 4.7	xxxiii
	Statistical analysis for Table 4.4	xxxiv
	Experiment 2	xxxv
	Statistical analysis for Table 4.5	xxxv
	Experiment 3	xxxviii
	Statistical analysis for Table 4.7	xxxviii
	Statistical analysis for Figure 4.15	xxxix

Table of contents

Statistical analysis for Figure 4.16.....	xl
Statistical analysis for Figure 4.17.....	xl
Statistical analysis for Table 4.8.....	xli
Experiment 4	xliii
Statistical analysis for Figure 5.1.....	xliii
Statistical analysis for Table 5.3.....	xliv
Statistical analysis for Figures 5.5 and 5.6	l
Statistical analysis for Figure 5.7.....	li
Statistical analysis for Figure 5.8.....	li
Statistical analysis for Figure 5.9.....	lii
Statistical analysis for Figure 5.10.....	lii
Statistical analysis for comparison between starting with pre-wet or dry coconut husk.....	liii
Experiment 5	liv
Statistical analysis for Table 5.4.....	liv

List of figures

Figure 2.1	Aerobic decomposition of uric acid in litter	13
Figure 2.2	Flow diagram of the global hydrological cycle	17
Figure 2.3	Schematic diagram of subsurface water nomenclature	20
Figure 2.4	A representation of NLC for the broiler industry	24
Figure 2.5	Flow diagram of composting processes using poultry wastes	26
Figure 2.6	Flow diagram of vermiculture processes using poultry wastes	30
Figure 3.1	Concentrations of macro-nutrients (not including Na) in the litter from five growers, belonging to two integrators	46
Figure 3.2	Concentrations of trace-elements, in the litter from five growers, belonging to two integrators	47
Figure 4.1	Loading procedure for small vermiculture experimental containers.....	53
Figure 4.2	Vermiculture containers with leachate receptacles.....	54
Figure 4.3	Plan view of earthworm dispersion (score of 1-4) after lid removed from ice-cream containers	55
Figure 4.4	Measuring conversion depth after inversion, note the unprocessed litter	56
Figure 4.5	Fully processed litter with a layer of persistent rice hulls	56
Figure 4.6	Depth of converted litter as a response to watering interval and volume	60
Figure 4.7	Mean total mortality as a response to watering interval and volume	61
Figure 4.8	The mean daily mortality for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes when comparing 1 and 5 day watering intervals	62
Figure 4.9	The mean daily dispersion score for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes when comparing 1 and 5 day watering intervals	62
Figure 4.10	The mean daily retraction rate for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes when comparing 1 and 5 day watering intervals	63
Figure 4.11	The mean daily mortality for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes daily where watering was stopped on day 8 and 13	64
Figure 4.12	The mean daily dispersion scores for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes daily where watering was stopped on day 8 and 13	65
Figure 4.13	The mean daily retraction rate for treatments receiving 100 and 200 ml volumes daily where watering was stopped on day 8 and 13	65
Figure 4.14	Mean daily mortality for four water regime induced stress treatments	66
Figure 4.15	Total N in earthworm bedding on day 2, 4 and 5 prior to watering	67
Figure 4.16	Electrical conductivity in earthworm bedding on day 2, 4 and 5 prior to watering	68

List of figures

Figure 4.17	pH in earthworm bedding on day 2, 4 and 5 prior to watering	68
Figure 5.1	The effect of earthworm bed loading and watering approach on earthworm mass and conversion time.....	79
Figure 5.2	Mean daily mortality over first 6 days for all treatments	81
Figure 5.3	Mean daily dispersion over first 6 days for all treatments	81
Figure 5.4	Mean daily retraction rate over first 6 days for all treatments	82
Figure 5.5	Change in TN concentration of earthworm bedding measured over 24 hours averaged for all treatments on day 5, normalised for S1	82
Figure 5.6	Mean change in TN concentration of earthworm bedding measured over 24 hours on day 5, normalised for S1	83
Figure 5.7	Change in EC of leachate from Treatment 7 during the conversion process	84
Figure 5.8	Change in pH of leachate from Treatment 7 during the conversion process	84
Figure 5.9	Change in DO concentration in leachate from Treatment 7 during the conversion process	85
Figure 5.10	Change in ORP of leachate from Treatment 7 during the conversion process ...	85
Figure 5.11	The effect of bedding type and inoculation on mean retraction rate of earthworms.....	87
Figure 5.12	Mean daily retraction of earthworms	87
Figure 5.13	Mean daily dispersion of earthworms.....	88
Figure 6.1	Processes involved in an integrated waste management system for broiler growers using a batch flow vermiculture system	96
Figure 6.2	Long-term mean rainfall and number of rain days (1857-2006), and evaporation and frosts (1981-2006) for Armidale	98
Figure 6.3	Long-term mean temperature information for Armidale from 1981 to 2006	98
Figure 6.4	Daily maximum and minimum air temperatures during the commercial bed stage	99
Figure 6.5	(a) Establishment of recruitment beds and (b) fungi growth	100
Figure 6.6	Holes in edge of earthworm bed after an ibis' beak is withdrawn	100
Figure 6.7	(a) Litter arrival and (b) bed establishment.....	101
Figure 6.8	(a) Earthworm recruitment beds at Laureldale using litter and (b) early morning frost on a recruitment bed	101
Figure 6.9	(a) Establishment and layout of the vermiculture system and (b) shade cloth covered beds	102
Figure 6.10	(a) Water application using sprinkler hoses (b) and application of inoculated water.....	103
Figure 6.11	(a) Oxygenating inoculation liquids, and (b) tanks, centrifugal pump (foreground) and commercial beds that are slightly elevated and draining back towards the tanks (background).....	104

Figure 6.12	(a) Friable vermicast at completion, (b) moisture difference with surface, (c) weeds on bed surface and (d) vermicast densely populated with <i>E. andrei</i>	105
Figure 6.13	Mean height of visually un-processed litter over the 108 days the system ran .	106
Figure 6.14	Unhatched cocoons on surface of commercial beds at completion	107
Figure 6.15	Diagrammatic example of aeration piping and forced aeration suitable for this batch flow system	109
Figure 6.16	Model of inputs used to maintain the system and the conversion of litter as a result of increasing watering interval, derived from the 200 ml treatments in experiment 1.....	114
Figure 6.17	Model of inputs and outputs from experiment 4 using coconut husk bedding over 78 days.....	115
Figure 6.18	Model of inputs and outputs from experiment 4 using vermicast bedding over 44 days	116
Figure 6.19	Commercial field scale model of the inputs and the likely variation of outputs by combining optimal parameters from both laboratory experiments and the Laureldale field trial.....	117

List of tables

Table 2.1	Type and volume of bedding material and volume of litter produced in Australia.....	7
Table 2.2	Chemical and physical composition of litter based on dry weight.....	10
Table 2.3	Trace element composition of litter based on dry weight	11
Table 3.1	Summary of sampling methodology for litter.....	44
Table 3.2	Mean gross-energy, pH, EC, B and Mo for each grower.....	47
Table 3.3	Coefficient of variation in litter for each grower, expressed as a percent	48
Table 3.4	Coefficient of variation in litter for each grower, expressed as a percent	48
Table 4.1	Volume of water and watering interval for experiment 1 treatments.....	57
Table 4.2	Volume of water and day watering was stopped for experiment 2 treatments.....	57
Table 4.3	Water volume, timing, and rate over the first five days.....	58
Table 4.4	The effect of watering interval and volume on earthworm dispersion and retraction	61
Table 4.5	The effect of stopping watering at day 8 and 13 on conversion depth, earthworm dispersion and retraction	63
Table 4.6	The effect of water volume on earthworm mortality	64
Table 4.7	The effect stress level on mortality, dispersion and retraction of earthworms	66
Table 4.8	The effect of stress level on volume leached, the concentration of NH_4^+ , TN and EC of leachate	69
Table 5.1	Treatment variables for experiment 4	77
Table 5.2	Treatment variables for experiment 5	78
Table 5.3	The effect of loading and water approach on mortality, dispersion, retraction and volume of leachate over the first 6 days and the EC of leachate at completion.....	80
Table 5.4	The effect of bedding and inoculation on mortality, dispersion, completion time and earthworm mass of earthworms	86
Table 6.1	Bed dimensions and loading rate for commercial beds 1 and 2.....	102
Table 6.2	Comparison of the mean chemical concentrations in litter before and after conversion into vermicast based on dry weight	106

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ATP (Adenosine triphosphate)
ADP (Adenosine diphosphate)
BSE (Bovine spongiform encephalopathy)
CAFO's (Confined animal feeding operations)
CEC (Cation exchange capacity)
C:N (Carbon to nitrogen ratio)
cv (Coefficient of variation)
DNA (Deoxyribonucleic acid)
DO (Dissolved oxygen)
EC (Electrical conductivity)
GEV (Gross energy value)
GHGE (Greenhouse gas emissions)
H5N1 (Highly pathogenic avian influenza)
ICP (Inductive coupled plasma)
Integrators (Integrated broiler processing companies)
Litter (Broiler litter)
LSD (Least significant difference)
NLC (Nutrient loop closure)
NO_x (Nitrogen oxides)
NSW DEC (New South Wales Department of Environment and Conservation)
OC (Organic carbon)
ORP (Oxidation-reduction potential)
RNA (Ribonucleic acid)
SE (Sample error)
SOM (Soil organic matter)
T (Metric tonne)
TC (Total carbon)
TE (Trace elements)
TKN (Total kjeldahl nitrogen)
TN (Total nitrogen)
TP (Total phosphorus)
USEPA (United States Environmental Protection Agency)
UNE (University of New England)
UV (Ultraviolet)