

**LANDFILL LEACHATE TREATMENT USING FREE WATER SURFACE
CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS**

SITI RABE'AH BINTI OTHMAN

A project report submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the award of the degree of
Master of Engineering (Civil – Environmental Management)

Faculty of Civil Engineering
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

NOVEMBER, 2007

*This work is dedicated to my parents Hj. Othman Hj. Kassim,
Hjh. Laila Mariam Hj. Pudzil and my family members who love
me and support me during my whole journey of education.*

Without you all who am I today!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

“In the name of God, the most gracious, the most compassionate”

I would like to thank and express my appreciation for the support that I received throughout my studies from my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Johan Sohaili and Pn. Normala Hashim and Cik Shamila Azman. They went above and beyond the call of my duty as members of my steering committee, and never failed to keep my eyes on the bottom line.

I enjoyed doing my M.Eng study under their supervision. Also, during my stay at Universiti Teknologi Malaysia I have had the chance to meet and learn from many people. Among them there are three individuals that have been a great teacher and friend, and have contributed to my studies by discussing and commenting on different aspects of this work. Special thanks go to Dr. Fadhil Othman, Dr. Fadhil Md. Din, and Dr. Azmi Aris as well.

Many friends and colleagues have contributed to my studies in many ways. The exceptional help, support and friendship that I received from Mohd. Izuddin, Mohd. Fahmi, Hafizi, Abd. Karim and Azhan.

Finally, I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to all my environmental laboratories technicians, especially to Pak Usop, En. Ramlee Ismail, Pn. Rosmawati and En. Muzaffar for their timely support during my stay in the laboratories.

“May Allah bless us with His Taufik and Hidayat. May we benefit from the knowledge He has given us. May we always be under His Protection and Guidance. May He forgive us for our sins, those we know and those we do not know. May He place us on the righteous path and steadfast our Imans. May He shower our one and true Prohphet Muhammad Alaihisalam and his family and followers, with eternal blessings. Amin amin, ya rabbal-amin”

ABSTRAK

Masa kini, pengurusan sisa pepejal dan rawatan air sisa merupakan masalah utama yang sedang kita hadapi. Jumlah sisa pepejal yang dihasilkan di seluruh dunia meningkat secara mendadak, begitu juga di Malaysia amnya. Walaupun terdapat pelbagai alternatif untuk mengurangkannya, atau untuk tujuan rawatan dan pelupusan. Tempat pelupusan sampah (landfill) masih kerap dipraktikkan di negara maju dan membangun. Walaubagaimanapun, kaedah landfill ini menyebabkan penghasilan air leleh (leachate). Air leleh (leachate) dari pusat pelupusan sampah adalah merupakan cecair yang menyusup dari sesuatu tapak pelupusan ke alam sekitar. Tanah bencah buatan (constructed wetlands) muncul sebagai salah satu kaedah rawatan alternatif yang berpotensi dengan menggunakan tumbuhan tenggelam (emergent plant) untuk menyingkirkan bahan cemar dari air leleh. Dalam kajian ini, tanah bencah buatan telah di bangunan menggunakan tumbuhan *Limnocharis flava* untuk merawat air leleh dari tapak pelupusan. Kepekatan air leleh yang berbeza (50% dan 33%) telah dikaji di tanah bencah buatan tersebut untuk membandingkan keupayaan rawatan dari segi keupayaan penyingkiran bahan cemar dan keupayaan penyingkiran tanah bencah buatan apabila masa tahanan hidraulik (HRT) yang berlainan digunakan. Keputusan menunjukkan bahawa keupayaan penyingkiran tertinggi bagi HRT 3 hari telah diperolehi di Cell B dimana peratus penyingkiran $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$, PO_4^{3-} , Mn, Fe, Turbidity, dan TSS adalah 83%, 88%, 91%, 92%, 100%, dan 98%. Bagi HRT 6 hari pula, penyingkiran tertinggi adalah $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, PO_4^{3-} , Turbidity dan TSS dimana peratusan adalah 98%, 98%, 100% dan 90% telah didapati di Cell B, selain itu, penyingkiran tertinggi bagi Cell A pula berlaku di HRT 6 hari dimana parameter yang diperolehi adalah $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$, COD, Mn, Fe, Turbidity dan TSS iaitu 93%, 91%, 90%, 94%, 100% dan 90%. Walaubagaimanapun, keputusan makmal menunjukkan bahawa keupayaan penyingkiran bagi HRT 3 hari dan 6 hari tidak menunjukkan perbezaan yang ketara.

ABSTRACT

Nowadays, solid waste management and wastewater treatment are the most important problems that we are facing. The amount of solid waste produced around the world is increasing at high rate as well as in Malaysia. Although there are different alternatives to reduce them or for their treatment and disposition, landfill is still the most common practice in developed and developing countries. However, the landfill method causes generation of leachate. Landfill leachate refers to the liquid that seeps through a landfill site and enters the environment. Constructed wetlands emerged as one of the potential treatment alternative that employed emergent plants to remove pollutant from leachate. In this research, a constructed wetland was developed by using *Limnocharis flava* to treat the landfill leachate. Different leachate concentration (50% and 33%) was studied in the constructed wetland to compare the treatment efficiency in terms of pollutants removal in leachate and the efficiency of the system in different hydraulic retention time (HRT). The result shows a better removal efficiencies at HRT 3 days can be obtained in Cell B where the parameter are $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$, PO_4^{3-} , Mn, Fe, Turbidity, and TSS (83%, 88%, 91%, 92%, 100%, and 98% removal). The highest removal at HRT 6 days are $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$, PO_4^{3-} , Turbidity and TSS (98%, 98%, 100% and 90%) can be obtained in Cell B, while in Cell A the highest removal parameters are $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$, COD, Mn, Fe, Tubidity and TSS (93%, 91%, 90%, 94%, 100% and 90%). However, the highest removal of COD can be obtained at HRT 6 days in control unit of 94%. However, the laboratory result shows that the removal efficiencies for HRT 3 days and HRT 9 days have not much different.

TABLE OF CONTENT

CHAPTER	TITLE	PAGE
	DECLARATION	ii
	DEDICATION	iii
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
	ABSTRAK	v
	ABSTRACT	vi
	TABLE OF CONTENTS	vii
	LIST OF FIGURES	x
	LIST OF PLATES	xiii
	LIST OF TABLES	xiv
	LIST OF SYMBOLS	xvi
	LIST OF APPENDICES	xvii
1	INTRODUCTION	1
	1.1 Reviews	1
	1.2 Constructed Wetland and Landfill	2
	1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
	1.4 Scope of Study	5
	1.5 Problem Statement	5
2	LITERATURE REVIEW	7
	2.1 Introduction	7
	2.2 What is Constructed Wetlands?	8
	2.3 Types of Constructed Wetland	9
	2.3.1 Free Water Surface Wetlands (FWS)	10

2.3.2	Sub-Surface Flow Wetlands (SSF)	12
2.3.3	Hybrid Systems	17
2.4	Theory of Operation	18
2.5	Aquatic Macrophytes	19
2.6	Treatment Process Mechanisme	22
2.6.1	Biodegradable Organic Matter Removal	22
2.6.2	Metal Removal Mechanisms	26
2.6.3	Removal of Nitrogen	26
2.6.4	Removal of Phosphorus	29
2.6.5	Solids Removal	31
2.7	Landfill Leachate	31
2.7.1	Leachate Generation	32
2.7.2	Leachate Composition	33
2.8	Leachate Contol Strategies	36
2.9	Type of Landfill	37
3	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	39
3.1	Introduction	39
3.2	Experimental Set Up and Operating Conditions of Constructed Wetland	41
3.3	Experimental Analysis	44
3.3.1	Analysis of Leachate	44
4	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	47
4.1	Introduction	47
4.2	Pollutant Removal In Leachate	48
4.3	Water Quality Analysis	51
4.3.1	Total Suspended Solid Removal	52
4.3.2	Turbidity Removal	54
4.4	Organic Matter Analysis	56
4.4.1	Biochemical Oxygen Demand Removal	56
4.5	Chemical Water Quality Analysis	58
4.5.1	Ammonia Nitrogen Removal	58

4.5.2	Nitrate Nitrogen Removal	59
4.5.3	Phosphorus Removal	61
4.5.4	Manganese Removal	63
4.5.5	Iron Removal	65
4.6	Analysis of Variance	66
4.7	Conclusion	67
5	CONCLUSIONS	69
5.1	Introduction	69
5.2	Recommendations	70
5.3	Conclusions	71
	REFERENCES	73
	APPENDICES	84

LIST OF FIGURES

NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Figure 2.1	Typical surface flow and subsurface flow constructed wetlands	9
Figure 2.2	Classification of constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment (Vymazal, 2001)	10
Figure 2.3	Free water surface flow (FWS) constructed wetland	12
Figure 2.4	The free water surface constructed wetlands in a foreign country	12
Figure 2.5	The subsurface constructed wetlands in a foreign country	13
Figure 2.6	Longitudinal constructed wetlands with horizontal SSF. Key: 1) Inflow of mechanically pretreated wastewater; 2) Distribution zone filled with large stone; 3) Impermeable liner; 4) Medium (Gravel, sand, crush stones); 5) Vegetation; 6) Outlet collector; 7) Collection zones filled with large stones; 8) Water level in the bed maintained with outlet structure; 9) outflow (Vymazal, 1997).	15
Figure 2.7	Typical arrangement of a vertical flow (VF) reed bed system	16
Figure 2.8	Hybrid constructed wetlands for wastewater treatment (based on Cooper, 1999)	18
Figure 2.9	Floating aquatic weeds (a) water lettuce (<i>Pista stratiotes</i>); (b) water lily (<i>Nymphaeaceae</i>)	20
Figure 2.10	Emergent aquatic weeds (a) Cattails (<i>Typha latifolia</i>); (b) common reeds (<i>Phragmites australis</i>)	21
Figure 2.11	Aerobic condition (oxygen from water column if FWS systems and from atmosphere if SF systems) (Chongrak and Lim, 1998)	23

Figure 2.12	Aerobic condition (oxygen from plant roots) (Chongrak and Lim, 1998)	23
Figure 2.13	Simplified wetlands nitrogen cycle (Kadlec and Knight, 1996)	29
Figure 2.14	Phosphorus removal process in constructed wetlands	30
Figure 2.15	Typical layout of landfill	32
Figure 2.16	Classification of landfill structures (Chew, 2005)	38
Figure 3.1	The framework of study	40
Figure 3.2	<i>Limnocharis flava</i> (yellow burhead)	42
Figure 4.1	Percentage of removal for Cell A and B for total suspended solids (TSS). The FWSCW system can reach until 100% removal for both cells.	53
Figure 4.2	Concentration of TSS as a function of sampling day for Cell A, B as well as control unit where the concentration at HRT 9 day reaches 0 mg/l. It was believed that all the particles are trapped in the media.	54
Figure 4.3	Percentage removal for Cell A, B and control unit in different HRT. The percentage removals are increasing steadily where the system can reach until 100% removal for those cells in FWSCW.	54
Figure 4.4	The turbidity concentration with different HRT for Cell A, B and control unit where the leachate concentration are decrease due to sedimentation and filtration that occur during the process.	55
Figure 4.5	The percentage of removal of COD for Cell A, B and control unit. The removals are increase steadily up to 94% removal in control unit. On the other hand, the removal of control unit higher than Cell A and B which was probably due to the presence of non-biodegradable organic compounds in the landfill leachate.	56
Figure 4.6	The effluent quality for Cell A, B and control unit with different HRT. The highest COD removal occurs in Cell B at HRT 9 day with 95.0 mg/l. The effluent quality for HRT 3 day can be observed in Cell A with 93.0 mg/l.	57

- Figure 4.7 The percentage of removal for $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ with different hydraulic retention time (HRT). The highest removal can be obtained in Cell A at HRT 6 day. The lowest removal of $\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$ occurs in control unit with 26% at HRT 6 day. 58
- Figure 4.8 The percentage of removal for $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ with different hydraulic retention time (HRT). The highest removal can be obtained in Cell B at HRT 6 day with removal 98%. The lowest removal of $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ occurs in control unit with 25% at HRT 9 day. 60
- Figure 4.9 The percentage removal of orthophosphate under different HRT. The highest removal can be obtained in Cell B at HRT 6 day with removal 98%. The lowest removal of PO_4^{3-} occurs in control unit with 23% at HRT 3 day. 62
- Figure 4.10 The percentage removal of manganese under different HRT. The highest removal can be obtained in Cell B at HRT 3 day with removal 91%. The lowest removal of Mn occurs in control unit with 48% at HRT 9 day. 64
- Figure 4.11 The percentage removal of iron (Fe) under different HRT. The highest removal can be obtained in Cell A at HRT 6 days with removal 94%. The lowest removal of Mn occurs in control unit with 17% at HRT 3 days. 65

LIST OF PLATES

NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Plate 3.1	Lab-scale constructed wetland	41
Plate 3.2	Dilution of landfill leachate before pour into the cells	43
Plate 3.3	Different concentration during the experiment	44

LIST OF TABLES

NO.	TITLE	PAGE
Table 2.1	Some environmental requirements of the aquatic weeds (adapted from Stephenson et. al., 1980; Reed et. al., 1988 and USEPA, 1988).	24
Table 2.2	Summary of removal mechanisms in wetland for the pollutant in wastewater (Adapted from Stowell et. al., 1981)	25
Table 2.3	Nitrogen transformation in wetlands	
Table 2.4	Landfill leachate composition from three different sources (Harrington <i>et al.</i> , 1986)	34
Table 2.5	Landfill Leachate Composition from new and mature landfill (Tchobanoglous <i>et. al.</i> , 1993).	35
Table 2.6	Landfill Aged Influence on BOD ₅ /COD Ratio and pH of leachate (Henry, 1987 and Amokrane, 1997)	36
Table 2.7	Classification of Landfill Structure (Pankratz, 2001)	37
Table 3.1	The characteristics of the <i>Limnocharis flava</i>	43
Table 4.1	Characteristics of landfill leachate used in FWSCW experiments	48
Table 4.2	Effluent concentration after treated by FWSCW for Cell A	49
Table 4.3	Effluent concentration after treated by FWSCW for Cell B	49
Table 4.4	Effluent concentration after treated by FWSCW for control unit	50
Table 4.5	Removal efficiencies in FWSCW at HRT 3 day	50
Table 4.6	Removal efficiencies in FWSCW at HRT 6 day	51
Table 4.7	Removal efficiencies in FWSCW at HRT 9 day	51
Table 4.8	Significant differences between control, Cell A and Cell B at HRT 3 days	66

Table 4.9	Significant differences between control, Cell A and Cell B at HRT 6 days	67
Table 4.10	Significant differences between control, Cell A and Cell B at HRT 9 days	67
Table 4.11	Percentage removal for three cells at HRT 6 days	68

LIST OF SYMBOLS

Ca	Calcium
CW	Constructed wetlands
Fe	Ferum
FWS	Free water surface
FWSCW	Free water surface constructed wetland
HRT	Hydraulic retention time
mg/l	milligram per litre
N ₂	dinitrogen
N ₂ O	Nitrous oxide
NO ₃ ⁻	Nitrate
NO ₂ ⁻	Nirite
NO ₂	Nitric oxide
NH ₄	Ammonium
Mg	Magnesium
Mn	Manganese
NH ₃	Ammonia
ppm	Part per million
SSF	Sub-surface flow
SSFCW	Sub-surface flow constructed wetlands
TSS	Total suspended solid
Zn	Zinc
VF	Vertical Flow

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX	TITLE	PAGE
Appendix A	Standard B Under Environmental Quality (Sewage and Industrial Effluent) Regulations 1979	85
Appendix B	Laboratory Analyses	86
Appendix C	Analysis of Variance	96
Appendix D	Figures Of The Whole Experiment	120

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Reviews

Over the last years, the high population growth rate, industrialization and urbanization, have been the causes for several environment all over the world. Nowadays, solid waste management and wastewater treatment are the most important problems that we are facing. The amount of solid waste produced around the world is increasing at high rate as well as in Malaysia. Kuala Lumpur and Selangor produced 7922 tonnes/day in year 2000, and this will increase to 11 728 tonnes/day in year 2010. For the states of Negeri Sembilan, Melaka and Johor, waste generated for 2000 for 2633 tonnes/day and 3539 tonnes/day are expected by year 2015 (Maseri, 2005). Although there are different alternatives to reduce them or for their treatment and disposition, landfill is still the most common practice in developed and developing countries.

However, the landfill method causes generation of leachate (Galbrand, 2003). According to Pankratz (2001), leachate can be defined as any contaminated liquid that is generated from water percolation through a solid waste disposal site, accumulating contaminants and moving into subsurface areas. As these wastes are compacted or chemically react, bound water is release as leachate. Landfill leachate

refers to the liquid that seeps through a landfill site and enters the environment. This liquid may already be in the material dumped into the landfill, or it may be the result of rainwater entering the landfill, filtering through the waste material and picking up additional chemicals before leaking out into the environment. Landfill leachate that escapes from the environment is most likely to eventually mix with the groundwater near the site. The quantity of these leachates is small as compared to others wastewater, but their contents are extremely hazardous (Tizaoui, *at el.*, 2006).

Landfills are potential threats to groundwater quality (Howard, 1997), the primary concern being the production and treatment of leachate (Eyles and Boyce, 1997). Major environmental problems have arisen from the production and migration of leachates from landfill sites and subsequent contamination of surrounding land and water (McBean et al., 1995). To prevent the adverse impacts of landfill leachate on aquatic life and degradation of water quality, landfill leachate has to be collected and treated before final discharge into the environment (Sartaj, 2001).

Conventional treatment systems are costly and require a long-term commitment. Moreover, the great variations in strength and flows of leachate as well as its toxic effect, due to presence of high concentrations of heavy metals and/or organic substances, make the use of these systems undesirable (Vesilind et al., 2002; Tchbanoglous et al., 1993). Many landfill operators are now considering non-conventional systems such as engineered constructed wetlands, which are low energy, do not require chemicals, and can satisfactorily address the leachate management problems (Sartaj, 2002). However, the modern landfill sites require that the landfill leachate to be collected and treated. Since there is no method to ensure that rainwater cannot enter the landfill site, landfill sites must now have an impermeable layer at the bottom.

1.2 Constructed Wetland and Landfill

The role of wetlands in water resource management is fact gaining ground resulting in the construction wetlands in most developed countries. Constructed

wetlands are man-made system that involves altering the existing terrain to simulate wetlands conditions. They primarily attempt to replicate the treatment that has been observed to occur when polluted water enters the natural wetlands (Chew, 2006).

Constructed wetlands have been used as an attractive low-cost method for controlling water pollution from both point and nonpoint sources (Olson, 1992; Mitsch, 1992). Dundabin and Bowmer (1992) have revealed that constructed wetland also show good potential for concentrating metals from industrial wastewaters. Wetlands prevent the contamination of groundwater or to prevent groundwater from infiltrating into the wetland (Kadlec et al., 2000). As reported by Olson (1992), constructed and natural wetlands also can contribute in reducing heavy metal and nutrient significantly to watershed water quality. On the other hand, constructed wetlands are also used to improve or restore some water bodies such as rivers and water basins (Nairn and Mitsch, 2000; Mitsch et al., 2005 and Mitsch and Day, 2006).

Among the aquatic treatment systems, constructed wetlands have a greater potential in wastewater treatment because they can tolerate higher organic loading rate and shorter hydraulic retention time with improved effluent characteristics (Chongrak and Lim, 1998).

The treatment of industrial and domestic wastewaters by passage through beds containing plants of the common reed (*Phragmites australis*), reedmace (*Typha latifolia*), or other species, has been widely practised in recent years, with varying degrees of success (Barr and Robinson, 1999). This has often been shown to limit the value of reed beds for treatment of raw landfill leachates. Engineered wetlands do however; have considerable capability for secondary polishing of leachates that have been pretreated in aerobic biological plants and for older leachates (Barr and Robinson, 1999).

There are two types of constructed wetlands: free water surface (FWS) wetlands also known as surface flow wetlands) and subsurface flow (SSF) wetlands (also known as root zone method wetlands or rock-filters) (Liehr et. al., 2000). FWS

systems consist of several basins or cells with the water surface being 0.12 – 2.0 metres above the substrate (Tousignant et. al., 1999).

However, both surface-flow and subsurface-flow constructed wetlands have been identified as promising technologies for the treatment of landfill leachate (Kadlec and Knight, 1996). Constructed wetlands have a small ecological footprint, utilize “low-tech” technology, and have an aesthetic value similar to that of natural wetlands. The application of wetland technology for treating landfill leachate is still developing (Nivala, et al., 2006). Wetland also was categorized in the Best Management Practices (BMP) which is one of the best to reduce non-point source pollution (Ayob and Supiah, 2005).

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to establish a diverse, self-sustaining, locally-modelled, native vegetation community bearing biological integrity treatment wetland site that effectively decontaminate the leachate input via phytoremediative, physiochemical and biophysical means. The hypothesis of this study is that “the selected native vegetation and vegetation establishment strategy will yield a successfully established site bearing biological integrity and that a naturalized system supporting biological integrity will effectively remediate the characterized contaminated leachate input”.

The purpose of this project was to evaluate the efficiency in the context of treating real landfill leachate on-site using a laboratory scale system. The more specific goals of the study are given below:

- a) To investigate the feasibility of applying free water surface constructed wetland system to treat landfill leachate containing high organic matters and nutrient, under different concentration of leachate;

- b) To determine the relationship between removal efficiency and different hydraulic retention time (HRT).

1.4 Scope of Study

This study comprises of a series of laboratory scale experiment. Leachate from a municipal solid waste landfill will be used. This study will cover:

- a) A laboratory scale wetland which will be developed for the treatment of leachate;
- b) Each system contained 2 cells. Each cells were planted with same number of plant 40 no. to 80 no. of plant.
- c) The efficiency of landfill leachate treatment system is analysed in terms of ammonia nitrogen ($\text{NH}_3\text{-N}$), nitrate nitrogen ($\text{NO}_3^-\text{-N}$), orthophosphates (PO_4^{3-}), COD, manganese (Mn), and iron (Fe). HACH DR/4000 spectrophotometer equipment was used for analysis of each particular parameter;
- d) The vegetation species that was used in this study is *Limnocharis flava*;
- e) All experiments were carried out in Environmental Engineering Laboratory, Faculty of Civil Engineering, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia.

1.5 Problem Statement

As cities are growing in size with a rise in the population, the amount of waste generated is increasing becoming unmanageable. The local corporations have adapted different methods for the disposal of waste such as open dumps, landfills,

sanitary landfills, as well as incineration plants. Besides, landfilling methods will generate a leachate and it will contaminate the groundwater table. These leachates may migrate from the refuse and contaminate surface and ground waters, which may affect human health and the aquatic environment. Treatment of these leachates in classical wastewater treatment plants is rarely practiced due to the nature and high levels of pollutants present in them (i.e. high COD, low biodegradability, heavy metals, pathogens, etc.). Dedicated treatment facilities are therefore required before the leachate being discharged to the environment or to the sewer system. As an alternative, constructed wetlands are suitable for treating leachate from landfill sites which can be very harmful if not treated properly. The problem with leachate treatment is that leachate changes in terms of strength, biodegradability, and toxicity as the wastes in the landfill age over time. Also, bearing in mind that landfilled wastes may take up to a hundred years to stabilize.