

## Accepted Manuscript

### Co-Management of Domestic Wastewater and Food Waste: A Life Cycle Comparison of Alternative Food Waste Diversion Strategies

Adilson M. Becker Jr., Kevin Yu, Lauren B. Stadler, Adam L. Smith

PII: S0960-8524(16)31437-7  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.10.031>  
Reference: BITE 17186

To appear in: *Bioresource Technology*

Received Date: 2 September 2016  
Revised Date: 6 October 2016  
Accepted Date: 9 October 2016

Please cite this article as: Becker, A.M. Jr., Yu, K., Stadler, L.B., Smith, A.L., Co-Management of Domestic Wastewater and Food Waste: A Life Cycle Comparison of Alternative Food Waste Diversion Strategies, *Bioresource Technology* (2016), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.10.031>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



## Co-Management of Domestic Wastewater and Food Waste: A Life Cycle Comparison of Alternative Food Waste Diversion Strategies

Adilson M. Becker Jr.<sup>1</sup>, Kevin Yu<sup>1</sup>, Lauren B. Stadler<sup>2</sup>, and Adam L. Smith<sup>1\*</sup>

1. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of Southern California, 3620 S Vermont Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90089
2. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Rice University, 6100 Main Street, Houston, Texas 77005

\*Corresponding author (Phone: 213-740-0473; Email: smithada@usc.edu)

### Abstract

Food waste is increasingly viewed as a resource that should be diverted from landfills. This study used life cycle assessment to compare co-management of food waste and domestic wastewater using anaerobic membrane bioreactor (AnMBR) against conventional activated sludge (CAS) and high rate activated sludge (HRAS) with three disposal options for food waste: landfilling (LF), anaerobic digestion (AD), and composting (CP). Based on the net energy balance (NEB), AnMBR and HRAS/AD were the most attractive scenarios due to cogeneration of produced biogas. However, cogeneration negatively impacted carcinogenics, non-carcinogenics, and ozone depletion, illustrating unavoidable tradeoffs between energy recovery from biogas and environmental impacts. Fugitive emissions of methane severely increased global warming impacts of all scenarios except HRAS/AD with AnMBR particularly affected by effluent dissolved methane emissions. AnMBR was also most sensitive to food waste diversion participation, with 40% diversion necessary to achieve a positive NEB at the current state of development.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/4997773>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/4997773>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)