

ACX0850

(P)

**COMPOSTABILITY OF DEGRADABLE PLASTICS AND  
ITS USE IN SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL**

**PUTRI NADZRUL FAIZURA BT MEGAT KHAMARUDDIN**

**Dissertation submitted to University of Malaya for partial fulfillment of  
the requirement for the degree of  
Master of Technology (Environmental Management)**

Perpustakaan Universiti Malaya



A510227766

OK

**Institute of Postgraduate Studies  
University of Malaya  
50603 Kuala Lumpur**

**May 2002**

## ABSTRACT

Plastic waste generation and quantity generated is a growing concern in many countries including Malaysia. Plastic waste contributes the third highest waste volume in Malaysian municipal solid waste (MSW) next to putrescible waste and paper. In the year 2000, plastic waste in MSW of Kuala Lumpur was 24.4% by weight from the MSW and most of the plastic waste was dumped into landfills. Landfills in Malaysia are reducing in its useful life as the amount of waste generated is growing every year by 2% and they have become an undesirable option of getting rid of plastic waste because of the properties of plastics. Thus, efforts are being made to divert some plastic wastes from landfills, or to use degradable plastics.

In this study a set of experiments was done to check on the compostability of polyethylene and prooxidant additive based environmentally biodegradable plastics under various conditions. The plastic samples were given by EPI Environmental Plastics Inc. The samples were exposed hydrolytically or oxidatively at a temperature similar to composting environment, which is 60°C. This was done to determine the abiotic degradation path, that is, hydrolysis or oxidative. The next experiment was to carry out the composting of the plastic samples through a 45 days-composting period. The degradation of the polyethylene and prooxidant additive based environmentally degradable plastics in these two experiments was determined by monitoring physical and chemical properties, such as, weight lost, percentage elongation and Fourier Transform Infra Red (FTIR) spectrum. Finally, degradable samples were exposed to *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* on carbon free media for 28 days in microbiological exposure experiment. Methods of determining the biodegradability of the plastic

samples were checked: on weight loss of plastic samples and sign of bacterium growth.

Plastic samples showed evidence of degradation in oxidative environment rather than hydrolytic environment as shown by the physical appearance of linear low density polyethylene (LLDPE) samples. The samples were brittle and changed colour from pinkish to light brown. In addition to that, the samples also experienced a significant weight loss of 8% and have been oxidised as shown by the addition of carbonyl groups in the FTIR spectrum. The high density polyethylene (HDPE) samples did not show any significant changes in weight loss, physical appearance and in FTIR spectrum. However, the changes in percentage elongation for HDPE samples were significant, for example McD, samples showed a reduction of 23.5% and TDP samples experienced a 60% reduction. Thus, this proves that oxidative environment is the optimum environment for degradation. There are various factors that influenced the rate of oxidative degradation. Among these are the amount of prooxidant additive, the chemical structure and morphology of the plastic samples. By right HDPE samples should degrade faster than LLDPE because its tendency to undergo chemically crystallisation faster. However, in this study LLDPE samples degraded faster than HDPE. Perhaps the amount of prooxidant additive Totally Degradable Plastic Additives (TDPA™) for LLDPE samples, which was 4% higher than HDPE samples, affects the degradation rate. In addition to that, LLDPE structure has higher amorphous regions that allowed oxidation to take place within the polymer structure. Another factor that influenced the rate of degradation of plastic samples was the surface area. The higher the surface area, the faster the plastic samples degraded.

In the composting environment, percentage elongation for all samples showed significant results of 20% reduction for McD samples and LL samples and 18% reduction for TDP samples. Lastly, the microbiological trial exposure showed a positive growth of bacteria and a weight loss of 2.2% for degraded polyethylene samples. This is very encouraging, as this proved that the organisms were able to utilise plastic samples as sole carbon source and thus confirming the biodegradability of the EPI Environmental Plastics Inc. plastic samples.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere gratitude goes to my supervisor Professor Dr. P. Agamuthu who actively guided me throughout the course and thesis work. He has always given me new ideas and suggestions to make my work easier and complete.

I thank Unit Penyelidikan DiTaja Universiti Malaya for giving me the monetary support for the project part of M.Tech. program through PJP (Vot F).

My appreciation to Universiti Teknologi Petronas for the scholarship given and the opportunity to gain more knowledge through the M.Tech. program.

I also thank Dr. J. F. Tung from EPI Environmental Plastics Inc. Australia for providing the samples and his valuable advice.

Last but not least, I thank my husband, Azlan Zahari and my sons, Khaizuran Fyrdaus and Khairunnas Haziq for their support and patience, and also to my parents and brothers.

# ***CONTENTS***

Abstract	i
Acknowledgement	iv
Contents	v
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	xi
<b>CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 History of Plastics	1
1.2 Plastic Usage	2
1.2.1 Malaysia	2
1.2.2 World	3
1.3 Plastic Waste	7
1.3.1 Malaysia	7
1.3.2 World	8
1.4 Objectives	10
<b>CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>13</b>
2.1 Biodegradable Plastics	13
2.1.1 Definition of Biodegradable Plastics	14
2.1.2 Types of Biodegradable Plastics	16
2.1.3 Plastics Application	20
2.1.4 Biodegradation Mechanisms	23
2.1.5 Characterisation of Degradation	27
2.1.6 Composting	29
2.2 Plastic Waste Management	30
2.2.1 Life-Cycle Engineering	31

2.2.2	Mechanical Recycling	35
2.2.3	Energy Recovery	41
2.2.4	Biological Recycling	49
2.3	Environmental Impact of Plastic	51
2.3.1	Plastics and Raw Materials	52
2.3.2	Plastics and Energy	54
2.3.3	Plastics and Production Effluents	56
2.3.4	Plastics and Waste	58
2.4	Relevance to Project	60
<b>CHAPTER THREE: MATERIALS AND METHODS</b>		62
3.1	Samples	62
3.2	Hydrolytic and Oxidative Exposure	62
3.3	Composting Exposure	63
3.4	Microbiological Exposure	70
<b>CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION</b>		73
4.1	Hydrolytic Exposure	73
4.2	Oxidative Exposure	81
4.3	Composting Exposure	91
4.4	Microbiological Exposure	101
<b>CHAPTER FIVE: GENERAL DISCUSSION</b>		108
<b>CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION</b>		114
<b>REFERENCE</b>		116
<b>APPENDIX</b>		124
ASTM D 6002-96		
ASTM D 6003-96		
ASTM G 22-76		

## ***LIST OF FIGURES***

Figure 1.1	Market segments in Malaysia in year 2000	2
Figure 1.2	Resin consumption and per capita consumption in Malaysia	3
Figure 1.3	Total consumption and per capita consumption in Western Europe	5
Figure 1.4	Market segments in for plastics United States in year 2000	5
Figure 1.5	Total post-user plastics waste by sector, Western Europe 1999	9
Figure 2.1	Drivers of materials technology shifts	14
Figure 2.2	Natural carbon cycle	16
Figure 2.3	Polymer derived from corn feedstock	17
Figure 2.4	Biodegradation trigger mechanisms	23
Figure 2.5	Formation of carboxylic acids and esters in the oxidation of polyethylene	25
Figure 2.6	Properties of the ideal degradable plastic	26
Figure 2.7	Techniques to determine polymer degradation	28
Figure 2.8	Life cycle engineering practices	33
Figure 2.9	Plastic waste management options	35
Figure 2.10	Cost balance for recovery of source separated household plastic packaging and industrial waste	38
Figure 2.11	Eco-efficiency of plastics packaging waste management	39
Figure 2.12	Influence of residue burn out	45
Figure 2.13	PCDD/F balance base case without additional plastics	46
Figure 2.14	PCDD/F balance with additional plastics	47
Figure 2.15	Degradation of materials containing C,H,O	50



Figure 2.16	Input of energetically valuable resources in the production of polymers	54
Figure 3.1	Schematic drawing of the aerobic bioreactor	67
Figure 3.2	Schematic of the laboratory-scale composting system	68
Figure 4.1	Changes in mass of McD samples on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions (60°) for various time periods	73
Figure 4.2	Changes in mass of LL samples on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions (60°) for various time periods	74
Figure 4.3	Changes in mass of TDP samples on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions (60°) for various time periods	74
Figure 4.4	Visual McD sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	75
Figure 4.5	Visual LL sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	75
Figure 4.6	Visual TDP sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	76
Figure 4.7	Changes in functional group of McD sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	77
Figure 4.8	Changes in functional group of LL sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	77
Figure 4.9	Changes in functional group of TDP sample on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions after 60 days	78
Figure 4.10	Changes in mass of McD samples on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions (60°) for various time periods	82
Figure 4.11	Changes in mass of LL samples on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions (60°) for various time periods	82

Figure 4.12	Changes in mass of TDP samples on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions (60°) for various time periods	83
Figure 4.13	Visual McD sample on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	84
Figure 4.14	Visual LL sample on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	84
Figure 4.15	Visual TDP sample on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	85
Figure 4.16	Changes in functional group of McD on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	87
Figure 4.17	Changes in functional group of LL sample on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	87
Figure 4.18	Changes in functional group of TDP sample on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions after 60 days	88
Figure 4.19	Changes in mass of McD sample on exposure to composting conditions for various time periods	91
Figure 4.20	Changes in mass of LL sample on exposure to composting conditions for various time periods	92
Figure 4.21	Changes in mass of TDP sample on exposure to composting conditions for various time periods	92
Figure 4.22	Average pH and percentage moisture content of synthetic compost mixture variations against time	93
Figure 4.23	Changes in functional group of McD sample on exposure to composting conditions after 60 days	95
Figure 4.24	Changes in functional group of LL sample on exposure to composting conditions after 60 days	95

Figure 4.25	Changes in functional group of TDP sample on exposure to composting conditions after 60 days	96
Figure 4.26	Viability control of microbiological exposure	103
Figure 4.27	Inoculated pre-degraded polyethylene sample plate after 28 days of microbiological exposure	104
Figure 4.28	Inoculated LL plate after 28 days of microbiological exposure	104
Figure 4.29	Uninoculated pre-degraded polyethylene sample plate after 28 days of microbiological exposure	105

## ***LIST OF TABLES***

Table 1.1	Plastic consumption by industry sector in Western Europe	4
Table 1.2	Total sales and captive use of selected plastics by major markets in United States	6
Table 1.3	Municipal solid waste composition in Kuala Lumpur and Labuan (% weight)	8
Table 1.4	Total solid waste and total plastic post-user waste in Western Europe from 1997 to 1999	8
Table 1.5	Increase of plastics components in United States MSW	10
Table 2.1	Crop yields with and without mulching films	20
Table 2.2	Calorific values plastics compared with conventional fuels	41
Table 2.3	Energy values of common materials in MSW	42
Table 2.4	Different feed conditions scenarios	44
Table 2.5	Clean gas emissions during packaging co-combustion	44
Table 2.6	Environmental impact of different recovery methods per tonne of post-separated plastic waste	48
Table 2.7	Composition of gaseous products from pyrolysis of mixed plastics (wt%)	49
Table 2.8	Advantages and disadvantages of polymer waste management options	51
Table 2.9	Energy <sup>a</sup> requirements for the production of materials used in packaging	55
Table 2.10	Energy requirements for similar beverage containers	56
Table 2.11	Air and water pollution associated with the production of 50,000 carrier bags	58

Table 2.12	Plastic contents in wastes from a few locations in Petaling Jaya, Malaysia	59
Table 3.1	Polymeric materials evaluated in the study	62
Table 3.2	Urban municipal waste composition (% weight)	65
Table 3.3	Synthetic MSW mixture used in this trial	65
Table 3.4	Normal saline solution	71
Table 3.5	Carbon free medium	71
Table 4.1	Changes in percentage elongation at break point on exposure to thermal hydrolytic conditions	76
Table 4.2	Changes in percentage elongation at break point on exposure to thermal oxidative conditions	85
Table 4.3	Changes in percentage elongation at break point on for samples exposed to composting environment after 45 days	94
Table 4.4	Case studies on the biodegradability of EPI TDPATM plastics according to data provided by EPI	97
Table 4.5	Changes in mass on of pre-degraded polyethylene sample exposed to inoculation of <i>Pseudomonas aeruginosa</i> after 28 days	101
Table 4.6	Changes in pre-degraded polyethylene samples mass in uninoculated plates after 28 days	102
Table 4.7	Rating scheme based on visual assessment used by ISO 846 for assessing fungal resistance of plastics	102