

**INTEGRATED USE OF CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR LIVESTOCK  
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND FODDER PRODUCTION**

**By**

**NGO THUY DIEM TRANG**

**Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Univeristi Putra Malaysia,  
in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science**

**February 2004**

## **DEDICATION**

I wish to dedicate this work to my beloved parents, Ngo Ngoc Huy and Pham Thi Leo, and respected teachers, supervisors who gave me knowledge and experience and

I also wish to dedicate this research to all the tropical farmers

Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science

**INTEGRATED USE OF CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR LIVESTOCK  
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND FODDER PRODUCTION**

By

**NGO THUY DIEM TRANG**

**February 2004**

**Chairman: Associate Professor Liang Juan Boo, Ph.D.**

**Faculty: Agriculture**

Constructed wetlands (CW) are widely used to treat wastewater (WW) because of its high efficiency for removal of pollutants, and low operational and maintenance costs. Plants play an important role in enhancing the WW treatment process in CW. Therefore, selection of the appropriate plant species to be grown in CW is an important criterion to ensure the success of the CW system. The performances of 5 plant species, namely, Typha (*Typha spp*), Dwarf Napier (*Pennisetum purpureum*), Guinea grass (*Panicum maximum*) and 2 varieties of Kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L) i.e. K 465/118 (K465) and Thai Kenaf grown in cattle WW were evaluated over 4 weeks. The different plant species were ranked using Typha (a widely use plant for phytoremediation) as a control based on their percentage of mortality, rate of growth of the root system, crude protein (CP) content, dry matter yield (DMY), and palatability score. The results showed that Typha had the highest score followed by Napier, K465 Kenaf, Thai Kenaf and Guinea. Based on the results of this study three

plant species (Typha, Napier and K465 Kenaf) were selected for further evaluations in experiment 2.

In the second experiment, the 3 plant species were grown in 3 different concentrations of cattle WW; low (COD 2,000 mg/L), medium (COD 7,000 mg/L) and high (COD 14,000 mg/L) in a 3 x 3 factorial experiment arranged in a RCBD design. Almost all of the Napier plants died by the end of the 2 weeks adaptation period. Typha and Kenaf had the highest above-surface fraction (stems and leaves) fresh yield (FY) and DMY in the medium WW concentration. The nutrient content of the 2 plants increased with increased WW concentration. The under-surface fraction (roots) FY and DMY of Typha was positively associated with the WW concentration, while negative relationships were obtained for Kenaf. Pollutants removal by Typha from WW was more efficient than Kenaf.

The third experiment was conducted to examine the efficiency of pollutants removal from cattle WW. It consisted of a 3 hydraulic retention times (HRT) (5, 10 and 15 days) x 3 plant types [Typha, Kenaf and no plant (as control)] factorial experiment, arranged in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with 3 replications. On average, the removal efficiency ranged from 58 to 65 % for Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD) for the various treatments, 77 to 94 % for Total Suspended Solids (TSS), 60 to 79 % for Ammonium Nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ ), 51 to 65% for Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen (TKN), 50 to 60% for Dissolved phosphate (DP) and 50 to 61% for Total Orthophosphate (OP). Nitrogen and P removal efficiencies of the cells with plants

were 11-19 and 7-11%, respectively, higher than unplanted cells; however, plants were not effective in COD and TSS removals. HRT contributed on removal efficiency for TSS and COD but not in nutrients removal. Effluent TSS for the 15 days HRT (46.7 mg/L) is within the permissible limit for effluent discharge from livestock WW in Malaysia. However, the average COD of the effluent discharge (684 mg/L) from different treatments was marginally higher than the permissible limit (500 COD mg/L) for effluent discharge from livestock WW in Malaysia.

Typha and Kenaf plants grew well in the CW and exhibited their potential as phytoremediation agents and possibly as a source of animal feed.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia dalam memenuhi keperluan untuk Ijazah Master Sains

**INTERGRASI PENGGUNAAN TANAH LEMBAB DIBINA UNTUK  
RAWATAN AIR KUMBAHAN TERNAKAN DAN PENGELUARAN FODER**

Oleh

**NGO THUY DIEM TRANG**

**Februari 2004**

**Pengerusi: Professor Madya Liang Juan Boo, Ph.D.**

**Fakulti: Pertanian**

Tanah Lembab Dibina (CW) telah digunakan secara meluas untuk merawat air sisa dan kumbahan (WW) disebabkan keberkesanan yang tinggi untuk menyingkirkan bahan pencemar dan kos operasi dan penyelenggaraan yang rendah. Tumbuhan memainkan peranan yang penting dalam mempercepatkan proses rawatan WW di dalam CW. Oleh sebab itu, pemilihan spesis tumbuhan yang tepat untuk ditanam di dalam CW adalah kriteria yang penting untuk memastikan kejayaan sistem CW. Prestasi 5 spesis tumbuhan iaitu Typha (*Typha spp*), Napier Kerdil (*Pennisetum purperium*), Rumput Kuda (*Panicum maximum*) dan 2 varieti Kenaf (*Hibiscus cannabinus* L) iaitu K 465/118 (K465) dan Thai Kenaf yang ditanam di dalam WW ternakan lembu telah diteliti selama 4 minggu. Kedudukan mengikut skor tertinggi sepesis berkenaan telah disusun menggunakan Typha (tumbuhan yang digunakan secara meluas untuk

fitoremediasi) sebagai asas kawalan bersandarkan kadar kematian, kadar pertumbuhan sistem akar, kandungan protein kasar (CP) hasil bahan kering (DMY), dan skor kesedapan. Berdasarkan keputusan kajian ini tiga spesies tumbuhan (Typha, Napier dan Kenaf K465) telah dipilih untuk penelitian di dalam eksperimen 2.

Didalam eksperimen kedua, ketiga-tiga spesies telah ditanam dalam konsentrasi WW yang berbeza iaitu konsentrasi rendah (COD 2,000 mg/L), sederhana (COD 7,000 mg/L) dan tinggi (COD 14,000 mg/L) didalam eksperimen faktorial 3 X 3 yang disusun dalam rekabentuk RCBD. Hampir semua tumbuhan Napier mati pada penghujung minggu kedua tempoh penyesuaian. Typha dan Kenaf mempunyai bahagian atas permukaan (batang dan daun), hasil segar (FY) dan DMY tertinggi didalam konsentrasi WW sederhana. Kandungan nutrien didalam 2 tumbuhan ini meningkat dengan pertambahan konsentrasi WW. Hasil segar (FY) bahagian bawah permukaan (akar) dan DMY Typha berkait secara positif dengan konsentrasi WW, manakala hubungan negatif telah diperolehi untuk Kenaf. Penyingkiran bahan pencemar dari WW oleh Typha adalah lebih efisien berbanding Kenaf.

Eksperimen ketiga telah dijalankan untuk memeriksa kecekapan penyingkiran bahan cemar daripada WW ternakan lembu. Eksperimen faktorial, yang terdiri daripada 3 masa retensi hidrolis (HRT) (5, 10 dan 15 hari) X 3 jenis tumbuhan [Typha, Kenaf dan tiada tumbuhan (sebagai kawalan)] disusun dalam rekabentuk RCBD dengan 3 replikasi. Secara keseluruhan, kecekapan penyingkiran bahan berjulat daripada 58 hingga 65% untuk COD, 77 hingga 94% untuk jumlah Pepejal Terampai (TSS), 60

hingga 79% untuk Ammonia nitrogen ( $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ ), 51 hingga 65% jumlah untuk Nitrogen Kjeldahl (TKN), 50 hingga 60% untuk Fosforus terlarut (DP) dan 50 hingga 61% untuk fosfat (OP). Efisiensi penyingkiran nitrogen dan fosforus oleh tumbuhan adalah masing-masing 11 – 19 dan 7 –11% lebih tinggi daripada sel tak bertanaman (kawalan); walau bagaimanapun, keberkesanan tumbuhan adalah rendah untuk menyingkir COD dan TSS. HRT menyumbang keatas kecekapan pengurangan TSS dan COD tetapi tidak untuk pengurangan nutrien. Effluen TSS untuk 15 hari HRT (46.7 mg/L) adalah di dalam had yang dibenarkan untuk effluen daripada WW ternakan di Malaysia. Walau bagaimanapun, purata COD effluen (684 mg/L) daripada rawatan yang berbeza adalah lebih tinggi daripada had yang dibenarkan (500 COD mg/L) untuk effluen daripada WW ternakan.

Typha dan Kenaf tumbuh dengan baik dalam CW dalam kajian ini dan ia mempamerkan potensi sebagai agen fitoremediasi dan berkemungkinan sebagai sumber makanan haiwan.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I respectfully express my appreciation and gratitude to my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Liang Juan Boo for his dedicated supervision, advice and encouragement throughout the period of my study. My appreciation and gratitude are also extended to Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mohammad Ismail Yaziz and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Liao Xin Di, members of my Supervisory Committee, for their advice and suggestion during my study and in the preparation of this thesis.

This project was partially supported by the National Kenaf Project sponsored by MTEN. I would like to thank Dr. Jothi Malar Panandam for her help in statistical analysis. I would like to thank to Mr. Shokri Jusoh for translating the abstract into Bahasa Malaysia. Appreciation is also extended to the staff of the laboratory and experimental farm of the Department of Animal Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Universiti Putra Malaysia.

I would like to thank my best friends Mr. Che Minh Tung, fellow students in the Department and all of my Vietnamese friends, both in UPM and in Vietnam, for their friendships, guidance and encouragement.

Finally, I would like to express sincere gratitude to my parents, Ngo Ngoc Huy and Pham Thi Leo, who made countless sacrifice for my future. Encouragements from my fiancé's family, sisters and brothers, and relatives are also acknowledged. Special

thanks to my beloved fiancé Mr. Le Hong Phuc for his love, patience, support, and moral encouragement throughout the duration of my study in Malaysia.

I certify that an Examination Committee met on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2004 to conduct the final examination of Ngo Thuy Diem Trang on her Master of Science thesis entitled “Integrated Use of Constructed Wetlands for Livestock Wastewater Treatment and Fodder Production” in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulations 1981. The Committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows:

**LOH TECK CHWEN, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**ZAINAL AZNAM MOHD JELAN, Ph.D.**

Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**CHE FAUZIAH ISHAK, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**HIROYUKI HIROOKA, Ph.D.**

Laboratory of Animal Husbandry Resources  
Division of Applied Bioscience  
Graduate School of Agriculture  
Kyoto University  
Katashirakawa, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto  
Japan  
(Independent Examiner)

---

**GULAM RUSUL RAHMAT ALI, Ph.D.**

Professor/Deputy Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date: 21 APR 2004

This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia and has been accepted as fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Science. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

**LIANG JUAN BOO, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

**MOHAMMAD ISMAIL BIN YAZIZ, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Science and Environment  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

**LIAO XIN DI, Ph.D.**

Associate Professor  
Faculty of Agriculture  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

---

**AINI IDERIS, Ph.D.**

Professor/Dean  
School of Graduate Studies  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:

**DECLARATION**

I hereby declare that the thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at UPM or other institutions.

---

**NGO THUY DIEM TRANG**

Date: 22 April 2004

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>DEDICATION</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>ABSTRACT</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ABSTRAK</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>	<b>ix</b>
<b>APPROVAL</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>DECLARATION</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>xiv</b>
<b>LIST OF TABLES</b>	<b>xvii</b>
<b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>	<b>xx</b>
<b>LIST OF PLATE</b>	<b>xxi</b>
<b>ABBREVIATIONS</b>	<b>xxii</b>
<b>CHAPTER</b>	
<b>1. INTRODUCTION.</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Livestock Production and Environment	5
2.1.1 Livestock Production	5
2.1.2 Impact of Livestock Wastewater on the Environment	7
2.1.2.1 Impact of Organic Matter on Environment	7
2.1.2.2 Environmental Pollution by Nutrients and Other Forms	9
2.2 Environmental Regulations	11
2.3 Livestock Wastewater Treatments	14
2.3.1 Anaerobic Lagoons	15
2.3.2 Aerobic lagoons	16
2.4 Constructed Wetlands	16
2.4.1 Definition and Function	16
2.4.2 Structure of Constructed Wetlands	18
2.4.3 Type and Design	21
2.4.4 Mechanisms of Wastewater Treatment in Constructed Wetlands	25
2.4.5 Limitations of Constructed Wetlands	28
2.5 Criteria of Plants for Constructed Wetlands	29
2.6 Criteria of Plants Suitable as Fodder	30
2.7 Potential Plant Species for Constructed Wetlands and Fodder	31
2.7.1 <i>Typha (Typha spp)</i>	31
2.7.2 <i>Kenaf (Hibiscus cannabinus L)</i>	32
2.7.3 <i>Dwarf Napier (Pennisetum purpureum)</i>	33
2.7.4 <i>Guinea grass (Panicum maximum)</i>	34

<b>3. SELECTION OF APPROPRIATE PLANT SPECIES FOR CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS</b>	<b>36</b>
3.1 Introduction	36
3.2 Materials and Methods	38
3.2.1 Study Location	38
3.2.2 Collection and Germination of Plants	38
3.2.3 Preparation of Plant Materials	41
3.2.4 Preparation of Cattle Wastewater	41
3.2.5 Experimental Design and Treatments	42
3.2.6 Management and Measurement	43
3.2.7 Percentage of Mortality	44
3.2.8 Palatability Trial	44
3.2.9 Chemical Analysis	45
3.2.10 Ranking Procedures	46
3.2.11 Statistical Analysis	47
3.3 Results	47
3.3.1 Biomass Production and Growth of Plants	47
3.3.2 Chemical Compositions and Crude Protein Yield	49
3.3.3 Percentage of Mortality and Palatability Values	50
3.3.4 Ranking of Plant Species	52
3.4. Discussion	53
3.4.1 Biomass Production and Growth of Plants	53
3.4.2 Nutritive Values of Plants	54
3.4.3 Mortality Rate and Palatability Values	55
3.5 Conclusions	56
<b>4. EFFECTS OF DIFFERENT CONCENTRATIONS OF CATTLE WASTEWATER ON GROWTH OF SELECTED PLANT SPECIES</b>	<b>57</b>
4.1 Introduction	57
4.2 Materials and Methods	59
4.2.1 Experimental Design and Treatments	59
4.2.2 Preparation of Plant Materials	61
4.2.3 Preparation of Wastewater	61
4.2.4 Wastewater Sampling and pH Measurement	62
4.2.5 Plant Management and Measurement	62
4.2.6 Chemical Analysis	63
4.2.7 Statistical Analysis	63
4.3 Results	64
4.3.1 Pollution Reduction	64
4.3.2 Dry Matter and Productivity of Plant Fractions	73
4.3.3 Chemical Composition of Plant Fractions	75
4.3.4 Nutrient Yield and Nutrient Uptake by Plants	79
4.4 Discussions	81
4.4.1 Wastewater Pollutant Reduction	81
4.4.2 Productivity and Nutrient Contents of Plants	81
4.5 Conclusions	84

<b>5. CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS FOR CATTLE WASTEWATER TREATMENT</b>	<b>85</b>
5.1 Introduction	85
5.2 Materials and Methods	87
5.2.1 Design of Constructed Wetlands Cells	87
5.2.2 Preparation of Plant Materials	89
5.2.3 Preparation of Wastewater	89
5.2.4 Experimental Design	91
5.2.5 Plant Sampling and Analysis	92
5.2.6 Wastewater Sampling and Analysis	93
5.2.7 Statistical Analysis	94
5.3 Results	95
5.3.1 Wastewater Pollutants Removal Efficiency	95
5.3.1.1 Chemical Oxygen Demand	95
5.3.1.2 Total Suspended Solids	96
5.3.1.3 Ammonium Nitrogen	97
5.3.1.4 Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen	98
5.3.1.5 Dissolved phosphate	99
5.3.1.6 Orthophosphate	100
5.3.1.7 pH Values	101
5.3.2 Fresh and Dry Matter Yield of Plants	102
5.3.3 Nutritive Values and Nutrient Yields of Plants	105
5.4 Discussions	108
5.4.1 Pollutants Removal Efficiency	108
5.4.2 Performance of Plants	114
5.5 Conclusions	115
<b>6. GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>118</b>
6.1 General Discussion	118
6.2 Conclusions and Recommendations	122
<b>REFERENCES</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>132</b>
<b>APPENDIX B</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR</b>	<b>140</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1 Cattle waste characteristics in two different farms in Malaysia	6
2.2 Proposed effluent standards for existing farms (mg/L)	13
2.3 Proposed effluent standards for new farms in Malaysia (mg/L)	13
2.4 Effluent standards for animal husbandry in Taiwan	13
2.5 Performance of vegetated and unvegetated wetlands beds	20
2.6 Typical Design Features for Constructed Wetlands	24
2.7 Performance of removal efficiency (%) of FWS and SSF systems	24
2.8 Nutritive values of Guinea grass cut at different ages	35
3.1 Score for percent (%) difference from Typha	46
3.2 Dry matter content (%), fresh and dry matter yields ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^2$ ), stem height and root length (cm) of the plant species	48
3.3 Chemical compositions (% DM) and CP yield ( $\text{g}/\text{m}^2$ ) of the plant species	50
3.4 Percentage of mortality (%) of the different plant species	51
3.5 Palatability scores given based on amount consumed and eating sequence by the goats	51
3.6 Ranking of the various plant species based on percentage of mortality, root length increase, CP content, DMY and palatability values	52
4.1 Initial concentration of COD, TSS, $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ , DP (mg/L), and pH in the 3 WW treatments	65
4.2 The weekly effluent concentration for COD (mg/L) of different treatments	66
4.3 The weekly effluent concentration for TSS (mg/L) of different treatments	67

4.4	The weekly effluent concentration for $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ (mg/L) of different treatments	68
4.5	The weekly effluent concentration for DP (mg/L) of different treatments	69
4.6	The weekly pH values (unit) of different treatment	70
4.7	The amount of tap water added to the experimental units over time (litres)	71
4.8	The weekly concentration of COD, TSS, $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ and DP (mg/L), pH (unit) and the amount of water adding (L) in 3 WW concentrations without plant	72
4.9	Dry matter (DM) content (%), fresh yield (FY), DM yield (DMY), and crude protein yield (CPY) ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) of above-surface fraction of Typha and Kenaf grown in different wastewater concentrations	74
4.10	Dry matter (DM) content (%), fresh yield (FY), DM yield (DMY) and CP yield (CPY) ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) of under-surface fraction of Typha and Kenaf grown in different wastewater concentrations	76
4.11	Chemical composition (% DM) of above-surface fraction of Typha and Kenaf grown in different wastewater concentrations	77
4.12	Chemical composition (% DM) of under-surface fraction of Typha and Kenaf grown in different wastewater concentrations	78
4.13	N and P at initial and final experiment ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ), N and P uptake ( $\text{g/m}^2/\text{day}$ ) by Typha and Kenaf in under- and above-surface fractions in different WW concentration	80
5.1	Percent removal efficiency (%) of COD for various treatments	96
5.2	Percent removal efficiency (%) of TSS for various treatments	97
5.3	Percent removal efficiency (%) of $\text{NH}_4^+\text{-N}$ for various treatments	98
5.4	Percent removal efficiency (%) of TKN for various treatments	99
5.5	Percent removal efficiency (%) of DP for various treatments	100
5.6	Percent removal efficiency (%) of OP for various treatments	101

5.7	pH values of various plant type and HRT in the influent and effluent (unit)	102
5.8	Fresh yield ( $\text{kg/m}^2$ ) (FY) and dry matter yield ( $\text{kg/m}^2$ ) (DMY) of under- and above-surface fractions, and root length (RL) and stem height (SH) (cm) of Typha and Kenaf at the initial and final of stages of the study	104
5.9	Nutrient contents (% DM) and nutrient yields ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) of under- and above-surface fractions of Typha and Kenaf at the initial and final stages of the experiment	106
5.10	Nutrient contents (% DM) and nutrient yields ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) of above-surface fractions of Typha (new and old shoot) and Kenaf (leaves and stem) at the end of the study	107

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.1 Cross section of the reed bed system at Großbeeren, Germany (horizontal flow)	22
2.2 Cross section of the reed bed system at Marienhöhe, Germany (vertical flow)	23
2.3 Generalized nitrogen cycle in the aquatic environment	27
3.1 Diagram of the overall of experimental arrangement in experiment 1	43
3.2 The increase in stem height and root length (cm) in 4 weeks for K465 Kenaf (K1), Thai Kenaf (K2), Typha (T), Guinea (G) and Napier (N)	49
4.1 The overall arrangement of the experiment 2	60
4.2 Effect of different WW concentrations [C1 (low), C2 (medium), and C3 (high)] on biomass yield in both fractions (above- and under-surface) of Typha (T) and Kenaf (K)	73
5.1 The diagram of each CW cell (side view)	88
5.2 The overall experimental design of the third experiment	91
5.3 Nitrogen and Phosphorus yields ( $\text{g/m}^2$ ) ((a) and (b), respectively) and the amount of N and P taken up ((c) and (d), respectively) by Typha and Kenaf for under-surface (Un-gr) and above-surface (Ab-gr) fractions	108

**LIST OF PLATES**

<b>Plate</b>		<b>Page</b>
3.1	The overall view of the experimental materials at the beginning of experiment	38
3.2	The five selected plant species for experiment 1	40
5.1	The overall view of the nine-cell subsurface-flow CW system at the beginning of the experiment	88
5.2	Preparation of cattle WW, filtering through the screen	90
5.3	The overall view of a nine subsurface-flow CW system (at the end of the experiment)	94

**ABBREVIATIONS**

CW	Constructed Wetlands
WW	Wastewater
COD	Chemical Oxygen Demand
BOD	Biochemical Oxygen Demand
OM	Organic Matter
TKN	Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen
NH <sup>+</sup> <sub>4</sub> -N	Ammonium Nitrogen
OP	Orthophosphate
DP	Dissolved phosphate
TSS	Total Suspended Solids
CP	Crude Protein
DM	Dry Matter
DMY	Dry Matter Yield
FY	Fresh Yield
CPY	Crude Protein Yield
ADF	Acid Detergent Fibre
NDF	Neutral Detergent Fibre
RL	Root Length
SH	Stem Height
N	Nitrogen
P	Phosphorus

AOAC	Association of Official Analytical Chemists
APHA	American Public Health Association
HRT	Hydraulic Retention Time
mg/L	milligram per liter
pH	Hydrogen Ion Concentration
cm	Centimetre
$\text{g/m}^2$	gram per meter square
$\text{kg/m}^2$	kilogram per meter square
SSF	Subsurface Flow
FWS	Free-Water Surface

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The trend toward large livestock operations has caused an increase in the volume and concentration of animal wastes on production farms, which can potentially desolate the environment. This is because many large livestock farms do not have the land on which to spread the manure, which is generally considered to be the most common way used to dispose livestock manure. Confined animal operations continually generate huge amounts of animal wastes, and therefore, these establishments must have a proper waste management system to adequately handle the wastes.

The environmental problem from cattle production in Malaysia is associated mainly with the intensive feedlot system where large quantities of cattle waste are produced. Unfortunately, feedlot operators have not invested enough in the treatment of their cattle wastes due to weak and intermittent enforcement of regulations to control the discharge of cattle wastes. Most of feedlot operators conveniently discharge their cattle wastes directly into nearby waterways (Jalaludin and Halim, 1998). Although cattle wastewater (WW) contains nutrients, particular nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P), which are potential nutrients for crops, the amount of WW produced in intensive livestock farms is often far in excess of agronomic requirements. This has led to repeated WW applications at rates that are greater than crop requirements, leading to