Declaration

I hereby declare that this submission is my own work and that, to the best of my knowledge and behalf, it contains no material previously published or written by another person nor material which to substantial extent, has been accepted for the award of any other academic qualification of a university or other institute of higher learning except where an acknowledgement is made in the text.



Amila Jeevan Wijayawardhana

July, 2008

To best of my time ways the best production.

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the continuous effort and guidance of Dr. Shantha Amarasinghe, Dr. Shantha Walpolage and Dr. Suren Wijekoon, all of whom were instrumental in designing the first gas phase biofilter in Sri Lanka which was successfully implemented and operational at Ceylon Tobacco Company, Kandy, Sri Lanka. I am extremely grateful for being considered to take part in the design effort and as a Research Assistant in carrying out this study. Dr. Amarasinghe is like a father to me, helping me and guiding me with the kindness and toughness that directed me to achieve my goals. His effort in leading and coordinating the design team and supervising my research lead to the amazing achievements we made during the past year. Dr. Walpolage was methodical in guiding me, giving me deadlines and always focusing me to my effort. His guidance in co-ordinating my MSc requirements and guiding my way through the stumbling blocks of research with an understanding heart made me determined to go through every step, step by step. Dr. Wijekoon, through his expert knowledge in biofiltration was a resource of knowledge to all our design work and research. I am grateful to the quidance he gave me on writing my thesis and correction of other publications. I would also like to thank Prof. Ajith de Alwis for the useful insignts and his role as an internal examiner. My special thanks goes out to my main examiner, Dr. C.S. Kalpage of the Department of Chemical Engineering, University of Peradeniya for his comprehensive scrutiny of the thesis and his invaluable contributions to the final manuscript.

This study is a result of industry funding by Ceylon Tobacco Company, Kandy. I am grateful to Mr. Rohana Bandara, Leaf Manager, CTC for the opportunity to carry out and publish results of this study. My thanks go out to all the staff members at CTC for the help they gave me to carry out my research.

All my thanks go to the following people for the following ways in they made my work easy to bear in the last year. To Achchi Amma and Athula Mama, for giving me shelter, feeding me and blessing me in my stay in Kandy. To Pasindu, for being an inspiration, for letting me stay in Nugegoda where countless nights were spent for this effort and tolerating me with all my idiosyncrasies. To Dilan, for being a great friend, for all the good times we had together and everything else that you do for me. To Tharaka, for helping me carry all the filter media to Kandy. To Lasantha, for developing the sensors. To Channa, my source of all help in Kandy. To all the industrial trainees from University of Peradeniya and Moratuwa, for sharing countless days of hard work gathering research data. To Aruna Shantha and the gang, for building the pilot plant. For Chaminda and Prashantha, supervisers of the full scale system for their magnificent effort in building the plant. Thank you all.

Nomenclature

BTEX Benzene, Toluene, Ethyl Benzene, Xylene

C_{in} Inlet Concentration (gm⁻³)
C_{out} Outlet Concentration (gm⁻³)
C/N Carbon to Nitrogen ratio

CFU g⁻¹ Colony Forming Units per gram

DEA Di ethyl amine
DMA Di methyl amine
DMDS Di methyl di sulfide
DMTS Di methyl tri sulfide

EBRT Empty Bed Residence Time
EC Elimination Capacity (gm⁻³h⁻¹)

GC-MS Gas chromatography-Mass spectrometry

H₂S Hydrogen Sulfide

K_s Half saturation constant

K₂HPO₄ Potassium di hydrogen ortho phosphate

MgSO₄.7H₂O Anhydrous magnesium sulfate

NH₃ Ammonia

NH₄CI Ammonium chloride $(NH_4)_2 SO_4$ Ammonium sulfate Odour units (m³h⁻¹) OU Poly Vinyl Alcohol PVA parts per billion ppb parts per million ppm Gas flow rate (m³h⁻¹) Q Removal efficiency (%) RE

TEA Tri ethyl amine
TMA Tri methyl amine
TOC Total Organic Carbon
TRS Total reduced sulfer

V Biofilter media volume (m³)

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Approach to the study	2
Aim and scope	
Justification	
Outline	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
Introduction	
Biofilter conditions and operational aspects Potential problems in biofilter applications	7 7
Biofilter media types	
Soil	7
Compost	8
Coconut Fiber Flectronic Theses & Dissertations	 გ
Lava Rock	8
Lava Rock	9
Synthetic packing materials	9
Composite beads	
Sugarcane bagasse	
Granulated sludge	10
Granulated activated carbon	
Treatment of odourous compounds by biofiltration	
Amine compounds	
Hydrogen Sulfide	13
Other sulfur compounds	
Methane	15
Ethanol	16
Hexane	
a – pinene	
Benzene, styrene, ethyl benzene, xylene and their mixtures	
Other compounds	
MATERIALS AND METHODS	26
Biofilter performance monitoring	26
Identification of predominant odourous substances in tobacco waste gas	∠ნ
Utilization of thin film sensor technology	21

3.2	Other analytical methods	29
3.3	Results presentation	29
3.4	References	29
	PERFORMANCE OF FOUR BIOFILTER PACKING MATERIAL FOR THE MENT OF A MIXTURE OF AMMONIA AND HYDROGEN SULFIDE FROM AN RIAL WASTE GAS SOURCE	30
4.1	Introduction	30
4.2	Materials and methods	32
4.2.1	Biofilter pilot plant set up	32
4.2.2	Packing Materials	
4.2.3	Inoculation and moisture addition	
4.3	Results and discussion	35
4.3.1	Performance of peat/wood chips media	35
4.3.2	Performance of coconut fiber/ tobacco compost media	
4.3.3	Performance of compost/wood media	39
4.3.4	Performance of synthetic inert media 25	
4.3.5	Comparison of media best suited for biofiltration	
4.4	Conclusions	
4.5	References Electronic Theses & Dissertations	47
5.	www.lib.mrt.ac.lk BIOFILTRATION OF A MIXTURE OF AMMONIA AND HYDROGEN SULFIDE	
UNDER	INTERMITTENT LOADING - INDUSTRIAL SCALE TRIAL	49
5.1	Introduction	49
5.2	Materials and methods	51
5.2.1	Packing material	51
5.2.2	Biofilter plant set up	51
5.2.3	Biofilter operation conditions	53
5.3	Results and Discussion	
5.3.1	General biofilter conditions	54
5.3.1.1	Biofilter temperature	54
5.3.1.2	Effect of watering flow rate	54
5.3.1.3	Effect of biofilter pH	
5.3.1.4	Effect of air distribution	
5.3.1.5	Media acclimation time	
5.3.1.6	Biomass growth	
5.3.1.7	Effect of pressure drop	
5.3.2	Ammonia removal	
5.3.3	Hydrogen sulfide removal	
	. •	
5.4	Conclusion	65
5.5	References	66

6. DESIGN, OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, TROUBLESHOOTING AND PERFORMANCE MONITORING OF AN INDUSTRIAL SCALE BIOFILTRATION SYSTEM 68			
6.1	Introduction	68	
6.2	Materials and methods	70	
6.2.1	Full scale odour abatement system	70	
6.2.2	Waste gas source		
6.2.3	Condensation unit	71	
6.2.4	Scrubbing unit		
6.2.5	Biofiltration unit		
6.2.6	Biofilter packing material		
6.2.7	Biofilter operation conditions		
Refer Sec	etion 5.3.3 for description on biofilter operating conditions	72	
6.3	Results and discussion	73	
6.3.1	Biofilter design considerations	73	
6.3.1.1	Space requirements and selection of location	73	
6.3.1.2	Ducting and fan selection	74	
6.3.1.3	Construction material selection	75	
6.3.1.4	Biofilter sizing	75	
6.3.1.5	Biofilterestructure Air flow distribution Moisture distribution	76	
6.3.1.6	Air flow distribution	77	
6.3.1.7	Moisture distribution	78	
6.3.1.8	Leachate control and drainage	/8	
6.3.2	System operation, maintenance an oubleshooting	80	
6.3.2.1	Operational aspectsVARSIIV. Of Moralliwa	80	
6.3.2.1.1	Filter media loading	80	
6.3.2.1.2	Biofilter moisture	80	
6.3.2.1.3	Biofilter temperature	81	
6.3.2.1.4	pH of the media		
6.3.2.1.5	Addition of nutrients	81	
6.3.2.1.6	Filter media mixing.	81	
6.3.2.1.7	Inoculation and media acclimation time		
6.3.2.1.8	Environmental conditions		
6.3.2.1.9	Online monitoring and process control	83	
6.3.2.1.10			
6.3.2.2	Biofilter maintenance		
6.3.2.2.1	Cleaning of air distribution system		
6.3.2.2.2	Weeding	85	
6.3.2.3	Troubleshooting	85	
6.3.2.3.1	Variations in air distribution through the media	86	
6.3.2.3.2	Development of anaerobic conditions	86	
6.3.2.3.3	Media compaction and high pressure drops		
6.3.2.3.4	Treatment of high concentration levels		
6.3.2.3.5	Non availability of nutrients		
6.3.2.3.6	Gradual and sudden variations in biofilter conditions		
6.3.2.3.7	Non availability of oxygen		
6.3.2.3.8	Microbial inhibition		
6.3.2.4	System performance		
6.3.2.4.1			
6.3.2.4.2	Scrubber performance	90	
	Biofilter performance		
6.3.2.4.4	Total system performance	92	
h /l	FUTURO OF PARTARMANCA MANIFORING	u.	

6.5 6.6	Conclusions	
7.		
8	APPENDIXES	100



List of figures

Figure 3.1: Portably hand held multiple gas sensors (left) and its use in taking sensor measurements (right)	. 27
Figure 4.1 Schematic diagram of plant set up for pilot scale biofiltration system	.32
Figure 4.2: Average removal efficiencies of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for peat/wood chips packing media	.35
Figure 4.3: Average elimination capacities of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for peat/wood chips packing media	.35
Figure 4.4: Average removal efficiencies of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for coconut fiber/tobacco compost packing media	.37
Figure 4.5: Average removal efficiencies of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for compost/wood chips packing media	. 39
Figure 4.6: Average elimination capacities of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for compost/wood chips packing radia	. 39
Figure 4.7: Average removal efficiencies of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for inert packing media	.41
Figure 4.8: Average elimination capacities of ammonia (triangles ▲) and hydrogen sulfide (squares ¦) for inert packing media	.41
Figure 4.9: Average removal efficiencies of ammonia for the four packing materials: coconut fiber/tobacco compost (circles ●), peat/wood chips (diamonds ◆), compost/wood chips (triangles ▲) and inert media (squares ■)	. 43
Figure 4.10: Average removal efficiencies of hydrogen sulfide for the four packing materials: coconut fiber/tobacco compost (circles ●), peat/wood chips (diamonds ♦), compost/wood chips (triangles ▲) and inert media (squares ■)	. 43
Figure 5.1: Schematic diagram of the industrial scale biofiltration system	. 52
Figure 5.2: Biofilter with two layers of media support	. 52
Figure 5.3: Ammonia removal efficiency (squares ■) and ammonia inlet (triangles ▲) and outle (circles ●) concentrations of biofilter under two testing conditions	
Figure 5.4: Ammonia elimination capacities for different inlet loading rates of the waste gas	60

Figure 5.5: Ammonia elimination capacities (squares ¦) and variations in inlet loading (triangles ▲) with time61
Figure 5.6: Hydrogen sulfide removal efficiency (squares ¦) and hydrogen sulfide inlet (triangles ▲) and outlet (circles ●) concentrations of biofilter under two testing conditions61
Figure 5.7: Hydrogen sulfide elimination capacities for different inlet loading rates of the waste gas stream
Figure 5.8: Hydrogen sulfide elimination capacities (squares ∤) and variations in inlet loading (triangles ▲) with time
Figure 6.1: Schematic diagram of the industrial scale biofiltration system70
Figure 6.2: Biofilter media support structure and irrigation system77
Figure 6.3: Modeled isometric projection view of the air plenum77
Figure 6.4: Main control panel (left) and modes of touch screen display (right)83
Figure 6.5: Ammonia removal efficiency by condensation (squares ∤) and ammonia inlet (triangles ▲) and outlet (circles •) concentrations for condenser
Figure 6.6: Ammonia removal efficiency by scrapping (squares) and ammonia inlet (circles) and outlet (triangles) concentrations for scrubber
Figure 6.7: Hydrogen sulfide removal efficiency by scrubbing (triangles) and hydrogen sulfide inle (circles) and outlet (squares) concentrations for scrubber9
Figure 6.8: Stack chart for total system performance for ammonia during system operational days: condenser efficiency (stripes), scrubber efficiency (squares) and biofilter efficiency (dots) 92
Figure 6.9: Stack chart for total system performance for hydrogen sulfide during system operational days: scrubber efficiency (squares) and biofilter efficiency (dots)93

List of tables

Table 3.1: Sensor resistance (R_0) of each sensor under specific concentrations	28
Table 4.1: Details of plant parameters and operating conditions	33
Table 4.2: Characteristics of biofilter media	34
Table 4.3: Comparison of the four packing media for suitability in a large scale biofilter	45
Table 5.1: Characteristics of packing material	51
Table 6.1: Characteristics of packing material	72
Table 6.2: Monitoring parameters and equipments/methods used in a monitoring program	84

