River Refugium Project (RRP)

CERNUNNOS FOUNDATION

BRIGHT MEADOW GROUP

Systems Analysis and Solutions Consulting

Document Title:

Appendix I: Compost Production and Integrated Poultry

RRP Document Number:

RRP0002-AppI

Version by date time group:

04 AUG 2026 0001

Cernunnos Foundation / Bright Meadow Group

Contact Information:

Email: robert@brightmeadowgroup.com

Website: www.cernunnosfoundation.com

RIVER REFUGIUM PROJECT Cernunnos Foundation Bright Meadow Group	**Appendix I — Compost Production and Integrated Poultry** Document No: RRP0002-AppI │ Version: 1.0 │ 04 AUG 2026 0001 Status: Published — New document, issued against Series Version 2.0 │ Supersedes: None *Contact: robert@brightmeadowgroup.com │ www.cernunnosfoundation.com*

Abstract

Appendix I defines compost production for the RRP framework. Compost is the root habitat for every container-grown plant in the system — trees, large herbaceous crops, and fruiting plants — and its quality governs their performance directly. The pathway applies the framework's central doctrine to its own residues: all non-product plant material becomes feedstock, and the resulting compost is a product rather than a byproduct. The appendix specifies feedstock inventory and blending, a resolved sequence for vermicomposting and thermophilic processing that the two practices otherwise make mutually exclusive, an integrated rotational poultry stage with a mandatory post-poultry thermophilic finish, three compost destination tiers governing where each batch may be used, the spent media return loop and the accumulation ratchet it creates, and the poultry biosecurity and feed qualification constraints that cross-link to Appendix E. It also states the framework's phosphorus argument: recirculating aquaponic systems are chronically phosphorus-limited, and river water is not. All process figures are provisional pending RRP pilot data per RRP8.

1. Position Within the RRP Framework

1.1 Compost Is Infrastructure, Not a Byproduct

Appendix F §4.5 establishes the two-material logic that governs all container culture in this framework: rounded river rock is corridor — water passage, oxygen delivery, bacterial surface area, and behavioral root containment — and compost is habitat, the biological home the plant builds a root relationship with.

Every rooted plant in this system is growing in compost. Its quality is not a horticultural refinement; it is the substrate the entire container-culture side of the framework stands on.

This applies identically to trees under Appendix F and to large herbaceous crops — including fruiting food crops where source water quality permits — grown by the same method in the same channels. The plant changes; the bucket does not.

1.2 The Doctrine Applied to Itself

The framework's position throughout is that waste is a category error — that material called waste is material whose use has not been designed. This appendix applies that position to the framework's own residues.

All non-product plant material from every pathway goes to the compost heap. Duckweed grown for compost is composted entirely. Algae likewise. Off-grade harvest, retting solids, coppice brash, spent stalks, alley clearings, and spent container media all route here rather than to disposal or, by default, to the thermochemical reactor. Compost is a competing destination for biomass and should be treated as one in routing decisions.

The Simple Version

The practice this appendix describes is old and it is not difficult. Pile the wet green material with enough dry stalky material to keep air moving through it, keep it damp but not sodden, turn it when it stops steaming, put worms in when it cools, and wait.

People have done this successfully for a very long time without measuring anything. An operator who reads nothing further and simply builds good piles will produce good media and will be doing the most important thing in this document.

The depth that follows exists for operators who must document what they made and for whom it was made — anyone supplying containers for food crops, anyone running poultry on the piles, and anyone recycling media on contaminated source water. Those situations carry real hazards and the detail is there because they do. They are not the common case.

1.3 Relationship to Existing Series Documents

Document	Relationship to Appendix I
RRP5	Thermochemical processing. Compost is a competing destination for the same biomass. Routing between them is an operating decision, addressed in §3.6.
RRP8	Governing document for measurement. Process control verification in Section 10 is additive to Axis 3.
Appendix E	Feed qualification protocol. Poultry in Section 6 consume system biomass, which places the birds inside the Appendix E protocol in full. See §8.1 — this is a hard constraint on which sites may run poultry at all.
Appendix F §4.5	Two-material logic. Establishes compost as habitat and is the reason this appendix exists.
Appendix F §6	Duckweed alley and compost loop. This appendix supplies the process detail that section assumes, and §3.3 inverts the same architecture into a dedicated feedstock bed.
Appendix F §6.4	Metal accumulation in recycled media. Generalized and given a control rule in Section 9.
Appendix H	Sequestration stations. Material from an H station never enters the compost stream under any circumstances — see §7.4.

2. The Phosphorus Argument

Recirculating aquaponic systems are chronically phosphorus-limited. Fish feed supplies nitrogen abundantly relative to phosphorus, phosphorus precipitates out of solution at the pH ranges these systems operate in, and it binds to biofilm and settles into solids. Practitioners supplement it — which means buying in the one nutrient the system cannot produce, and the supplement is mined rock phosphate.

River water does not have this problem. Agricultural drainage carries phosphorus in surplus, and phosphorus loading is one of the two contaminants the entire framework exists to intercept.

The framework therefore does not inherit aquaponics' structural nutrient deficiency. It inherits the opposite condition, and the compost pathway is where phosphorus captured from the water is stabilized into a form that container-grown plants can use over a season rather than a week.

Rock phosphate is a finite mined resource with a concentrated global supply. A system that recovers phosphorus from a river and returns it to production, rather than buying mined phosphate and losing it downstream, is running the material cycle in the correct direction. This is a substantive argument and it belongs alongside the nitrogen case rather than beneath it.

3. Feedstock

3.1 Inventory

Source	Character	Role in Blend	Notes
Duckweed, azolla, algae	Wet, high nitrogen, low structure	Primary nitrogen fraction	Very high moisture. Mats and goes anaerobic if piled alone. Must be blended, not stacked.
Coppice brash and chip	Dry, high carbon, high lignin	Primary carbon and structure fraction	Provides porosity for passive aeration. The most valuable single input for pile structure.
Shive, hurd, retting solids	Dry to wet, high carbon	Carbon fraction	From Appendix G. Retting solids arrive wet and acidic; blend rather than concentrate.
Off-grade crop residue	Variable	Bulk	Stalks, trimmings, failed harvest, alley clearings from all pathways.
Settled solids	Wet, fine, nutrient-dense	Nitrogen and phosphorus	From Stage 1 settling and refugium cleanout. Fine texture — needs structural material to avoid compaction.
Spent container media	Aged, stable, structured	Inoculant and bulk	Returned from cycled-out plantings. Carries an accumulation constraint — see Section 9.
Poultry manure and bedding	Wet, very high nitrogen	Nitrogen and biological activation	Deposited in place per Section 6, and cleaned from the mobile coop. Governs the sequencing problem in Section 7.

Table I-1. *Compost feedstock inventory. Every entry is material that would otherwise be a disposal item or a default thermochemical input.*

3.2 Three Materials, Two Jobs

The framework produces an unusual feedstock profile: enormous quantities of very wet, unstructured, nitrogen-rich aquatic biomass, and a comparatively limited supply of dry structural material. Solving that requires separating two requirements that are frequently conflated.

Requirement	What It Is	What Satisfies It
Bulking	Physical. Holding void space so air moves through the pile. The governing property is rigidity that survives three weeks of heat and moisture, not coarseness at the point of mixing.	Coarse chip, chopped stalk, shive, hurd, emergent stem. Soft tissue collapses as it degrades, which is exactly when porosity is most needed.

Carbon	Chemical. The carbon-to-nitrogen ratio — what the microbial population consumes.	Any vascular stem tissue. Splits further into fast cellulosic carbon, which fuels the thermophilic phase and is consumed, and lignified carbon, which largely survives and becomes the stable humus fraction.
Nitrogen	Chemical. The other half of the ratio, and the fraction this framework produces in surplus.	Duckweed, azolla, algae, settled solids, poultry manure.

Table I-2. *Bulking is a physical requirement and carbon is a chemical one. No aquatic material satisfies either.*

Duckweed and algae piled alone do not compost. They mat, exclude air, go anaerobic, and produce a sour dense mass. No selection among aquatic species changes this — algae has essentially no lignin regardless of morphology, and most filamentous species mat worse than duckweed rather than better. Structural material is not an amendment to the pile; it is what makes the pile possible.

- Target blend in the range of 25:1 to 40:1 carbon to nitrogen by weight, consistent with established compost practice. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — to be established by trial on actual feedstock.
- Moisture in the range of 50 to 60 percent. Aquatic feedstock arrives far above this and requires draining, pre-drying, or heavy structural blending.
- Porosity governs. A pile at correct C:N with no structure will still go anaerobic.

The last point is the same principle that governs the aerated channel in Appendix F §4.3 and the redox cells in Appendix H, arriving in a different form. A compost pile is a gas exchange problem before it is a chemistry problem, and structure is how the exchange happens without machinery. Where the channel uses forced aeration, the pile uses void space and turning — but the failure mode is identical, and so is the smell that announces it.

3.3 The Inverted Feedstock Bed

The carbon shortage is solved by geometry rather than by importing material. A dedicated feedstock bed runs the Appendix F architecture with its purposes reversed.

In a coppice bed, the trees are the crop and the duckweed alley is the support stage. In a feedstock bed, the containers grow the structural carbon crop and the alley grows the nitrogen. One bed produces a balanced blend instead of two pathways having to find each other.

- Containers: fast, high-biomass stem crops — sorghum-sudangrass, switchgrass, miscanthus, sunflower, reed canary where not restricted. Grown for stalk rather than for seed or forage quality.
- Alley: duckweed and azolla as the nitrogen fraction, per Appendix F §6.
- Emergent structural aquatics may occupy alley margins — cattail, bulrush, sedge, papyrus and umbrella sedge in warm deployments. Real stem tissue, fast, and tolerant of exactly the conditions the alley provides.

The feedstock bed is worth noting as the first deliberate polyculture in the series — container stem crop, alley aquatic, and emergent margin occupying three distinct niches in one channel simultaneously. Single-crop houses are presented throughout the framework for clarity of illustration and because per-cell performance data cannot be attributed in a mixed planting. The mature form of every pathway here is polyculture; the data required to design it does not yet exist.

Two constraints. Emergent stem is cellulosic rather than lignified, so it bulks and composts well but is consumed rather than persistent — some woody carbon still earns its place as the durable humus fraction that matters in year eight of a coppice container. And the species exclusions in Appendix H §2.2 apply here without modification: giant reed and several other aggressive emergents are restricted in multiple states and are not worth the permitting argument.

3.4 R-2 Vegetation Is Already Being Grown

Appendix F §5.3 specifies the R-2 vegetated refugium cell planted to cattail, bulrush, or sedge, explicitly not harvested for feed. That biomass is currently unassigned in the series.

It is the cheapest structural material a site produces, because it is a byproduct of a stage being built anyway for water conditioning. Any site running a full refugium configuration has a standing bulking supply it is not currently claiming, and R-2 harvest should be scheduled into the compost feedstock calendar rather than treated as cell maintenance.

3.5 Screen and Return

Bulking agent is recoverable. Screening finished compost separates the coarse fraction that did not break down — chip, stem, shive — and returns it to the next pile.

This substantially reduces net structural demand, because the same material serves several cycles before it is finally consumed. It also self-selects usefully: what survives a hot pile is the lignified material that was going to be the durable humus fraction anyway, so the loop recycles the persistent carbon and consumes the fast carbon. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — recovery fraction and number of viable cycles unestablished.

3.6 Compost or Reactor

Biomass routed to compost is biomass not routed to HTC or HTL. The routing decision should be made deliberately rather than by default, and the two reactors want different material.

- HTC wants lignocellulose — dry, structural, high-lignin. Brash, chip, shive, stalk.
- HTL wants lipid, and is indifferent to moisture because the process runs in water. This is the algae route, and lipid fraction is what determines whether the run is worth making.
- Compost wants everything else, plus a share of the lignified fraction for durable structure.

The competition is real and it is over lignin. The fraction HTC values most is the same fraction that makes container media last a decade. On a site running Appendix F, the compost claim on coppice brash may be the stronger of the two, and that should be decided rather than defaulted.

3.7 Lipid Is a Condition, Not a Species

Lipid accumulation in microalgae is driven by nutrient stress, particularly nitrogen limitation. A well-fed culture grows fast and builds protein; a starved culture grows slowly and packs on storage lipid. High productivity and high lipid fraction are not simultaneously available from the same culture.

The framework's defining condition is abundant nitrogen, which inherently produces fast, high-protein, low-lipid algae. That material is compost-grade and feed-grade, and it is the correct default. It is also poor HTL feedstock, and no species selection changes that.

This cuts favorably on the compost side. High-lipid biomass composts badly — lipids are hydrophobic, slow to degrade, shed water, and drive anaerobic pockets. Low-lipid algae is the better compost feedstock for precisely the reason it is the worse fuel feedstock, so both destinations receive their preferred material rather than compromising.

3.8 Fuel Algae by Position — Grow Fed, Finish Lean

Where HTL feedstock is wanted, it is produced by position in the train rather than by starving a culture on nutrient-rich water.

- Grow in an early house where nitrogen is abundant, accumulating biomass at full productivity.
- Scoop the culture forward into a terminal finishing house running on water the upstream stages have already stripped.
- Hold through depletion. The cells arrive with standing biomass and continuing photosynthesis, and nowhere to put fixed carbon except storage lipid.
- Harvest at lipid peak.

The transition is what triggers accumulation. A culture held at steady low nutrient is merely slow; a culture moved from adequate to depleted responds. Batch transfer also solves the yield problem — a continuous polish stage produces a trickle, while a finishing bay accumulates upstream and finishes downstream.

Harvest timing is determined by test, not by calendar. Lipid accumulates and then the culture declines and loses it, and that window is the entire yield. The endpoint discipline is the same as retting in Appendix G §5.3.

3.9 Bed Geometry Follows Function

	Growing and Feed Beds	Lipid Finishing Bay
Depth	Deep. Duckweed and azolla are surface crops; depth is nutrient reservoir and thermal mass.	Thin layer. Light attenuates rapidly with depth and the whole objective is photons per cell.
Density	Dense. Surface coverage is the harvest trigger.	Transfer density is the governing parameter. Overloading self-shades, and shaded plus starved is death rather than lipid.
Bottom	Not a design variable.	White or reflective, returning light through the layer for a second pass. Not transparent — a clear floor loses photons downward and fouls where it cannot be cleaned.
Light	Adequate.	Maximum available. Terminal position in the run is convenient — nothing downstream shades it.
Stability	High. Volume buffers temperature.	Low. Shallow water swings temperature fast and evaporates hard — shade or flow management required on hot days. Evaporative loss is recoverable per RRP4 §4.

Table I-3. *Bed geometry by function. The finishing bay is a different structure, not a smaller version of a growing bed.*

Downstream dependency: the finishing house is a greenhouse assignment and the scoop-forward operation is a routing behavior. Neither is described in RRP4 or RRP6. Formalizing them requires an amendment to the greenhouse assignment schedule that this appendix does not make.

4. Worms

A maintained bin of red wigglers (Eisenia fetida) is standing stock. It is not a top-up reservoir against occasional losses — it is the breeding unit that supplies every pile in the rotation, every cycle, and it is sized to paddock throughput rather than to mortality replacement.

In a pile worked by poultry, worms are a consumed input rather than a resident population. They are a crop, and the birds harvest them.

This has to be planned for rather than discovered. Worms introduced at K-3 do their fragmentation and casting work, and are then substantially converted into eggs at K-4. Some fraction persists in the cool base and the deep margins where birds cannot work effectively, but it is not a population an operator should plan around. Re-inoculation at K-6 draws fresh stock from the bin.

The bin must therefore be protected from the birds absolutely, and its production rate is a hard constraint on how many paddocks a site can run. Losing the bin does not cost one pile — it costs the vermicompost stage across every paddock simultaneously, with a rebuild time measured in months.

4.1 What Worms Contribute

- Fragmentation and surface area increase, accelerating microbial access.
- Passage through the gut, which produces castings with markedly different structure and microbial character than microbial decomposition alone.
- Aggregate structure and water-holding capacity — precisely the properties that make compost function as habitat rather than as fertilizer under the Appendix F §4.5 logic.
- Continuous mixing and aeration without mechanical turning.
- Protein for the poultry stage, which is a deliberate output rather than an incidental loss. See §6.1 and the constraint in §8.1.

For a substrate whose job is to host a decade-long root relationship, the structural contribution matters more than the nutrient contribution.

4.2 The Temperature Conflict

Worms and Thermophilic Composting Are Mutually Exclusive in the Same Volume

Eisenia fetida is comfortable in roughly the 15–25°C range, is stressed above about 30°C, and dies at temperatures well below what a thermophilic pile is required to reach. Pathogen reduction in composting depends on sustained temperatures in the 55–70°C range.

A pile cannot be both at once. Worms placed into a pile on day one will either be killed when it heats, or will prevent it from heating because the pile is being kept cool enough for them — in which case there is no thermophilic kill step and the batch cannot be used where pathogen reduction matters.

This is not an argument against day-one worm introduction. It is the reason Section 7 exists.

4.3 The Two Resolutions

Both are legitimate and they produce different products for different destinations.

- Mantle configuration — worms introduced at the outer margin and base of a hot-cored pile, where temperatures remain tolerable. Worms self-regulate by migration, working inward as the core cools. This permits early introduction and a hot core simultaneously, at the cost of a temperature gradient that makes uniform pathogen reduction unverifiable without turning.

- Sequenced configuration — thermophilic phase first with no worms, worms introduced at the start of the curing phase as the pile falls below tolerance. Slower to establish worm population but produces a verifiable kill step.

Destination determines which applies. See Section 7.

5. Paddock Architecture

5.1 Configuration

- A series of wire-enclosed paddocks, each carrying a compost pile at a defined stage.
- Wire Quonset arch over each paddock — overhead and side exclusion in a single structure. This is the correct trade: a modest structural cost buys near-complete relief from aerial and terrestrial predation, which is otherwise the dominant loss factor in any pastured poultry operation.
- A mobile coop moved paddock to paddock, providing night housing, nest boxes, and feed and water.
- The coop is removable for cleaning between rotations, and its bedding returns to the feedstock stream.

5.2 Rotation Logic

New piles are built continuously at the head of the sequence. The birds work behind them, moving to each pile as it reaches the stage described in Section 6, and vacated paddocks rest.

The rest interval is the point of the rotation. Poultry parasites — coccidia in particular, and the common nematodes — depend on birds returning to their own accumulated droppings within the infective window. Moving the flock forward and leaving each paddock empty for a full cycle breaks that transmission chain without medication.

Rest interval is therefore a health parameter, not a scheduling convenience. Paddock count is set by the interval required to break the cycle divided by the residency time in each, and shortening the rotation to accommodate throughput defeats the purpose of building it. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — interval to be established from flock health monitoring.

5.3 The Two-Speed Problem

Compost maturation and parasite rest intervals are set by different biology and do not naturally align. Paddock count must satisfy whichever is longer, and the operating schedule must not compress either. A site that sizes its paddock count on compost throughput alone will find the flock cycling faster than the rest interval permits.

6. The Poultry Stage

6.1 What the Birds Do

Birds are moved onto a pile as it matures and develops an invertebrate population — worms, larvae, and the associated arthropod community that a maturing pile supports.

- Scratching, which turns and aerates the pile continuously and at no labor cost, and which is the behavior the whole arrangement is built to exploit.
- Manure deposition directly into the material, adding nitrogen at the point of use with no handling, no storage, and no spreading.

- Invertebrate predation. The worms and larvae are a deliberate protein ration, not incidental foraging — which is why worms are treated as a consumed crop in Section 4 and why the transfer chain in §8.1 matters.
- Fragmentation of remaining coarse material.

6.2 The Egg Is the Bonus

The framing matters for how the operation is designed and evaluated. The birds are there to work the pile and to deposit nitrogen. Eggs are a genuine second product and should be captured and sold, but the poultry stage is not justified by egg revenue and should not be sized to it.

This has a practical consequence: flock size is set by pile throughput and by paddock rest interval per §5.3, not by market demand for eggs. A flock sized to egg sales will overwork the piles and compress the rotation.

6.3 Residency

Birds remain on a pile until scratching has worked it down and the invertebrate population is depleted, then move forward. Overstaying produces excess manure loading, compaction, and a bare, overworked paddock. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — residency duration to be established by trial.

7. The Sequencing Problem

7.1 Stating It Plainly

Poultry Arrive After the Kill Step, Not Before

The design places birds on a pile once it has matured and cooled enough to support worms and invertebrates — which is, by definition, after the thermophilic phase has ended.

The birds then deposit fresh raw manure into material that has already completed its pathogen reduction. Poultry manure carries Salmonella and Campylobacter. The result is a finished-looking compost that has been re-inoculated after its kill step and has no subsequent validated treatment.

For compost destined for coppice buckets or fiber crops this is a manageable risk. For compost destined for containers growing food crops, it is a food safety failure, and it is exactly the failure a produce safety auditor is trained to look for.

7.2 The Resolution — Mandatory Post-Poultry Thermophilic Finish

The instinct in the original design — turning the pile for a few days after the birds move on — is correct and is formalized here as a required process stage rather than an optional finishing step.

After the birds leave, the pile is re-blended with fresh carbon and driven through a second, verified thermophilic cycle. The manure the birds deposited is treated as what it is: a raw nitrogen input to a new composting cycle, not a finishing amendment to a completed one.

This resolves the problem completely and costs little, because the material is already blended, already biologically active, and already in place. It also puts the poultry nitrogen to work rather than leaving it as a surface deposit.

No worm recovery step is specified before K-5, because by that point the birds have already taken most of the population. Re-inoculation at K-6 draws fresh stock from the bin per Section 4, and that replacement is a planned cost of every cycle rather than an exception.

7.3 The Resulting Sequence

Stage	Phase	Condition	Notes
K-1	Build and blend	Feedstock combined to target C:N, moisture, and porosity per §3.2	Structural carbon is the limiting input. Spent media added here per Section 9.
K-2	First thermophilic	Sustained elevated temperature with turning; monitored per Section 10	Worms at mantle only, or withheld entirely in sequenced configuration.
K-3	Cure and vermicompost	Temperature falls into worm tolerance; worms work the full volume	Invertebrate population develops. This is what attracts and feeds the birds.
K-4	Poultry	Birds work the pile; manure deposited in place	Subject to the constraints in Section 8. Ends when invertebrates are depleted.
K-5	Second thermophilic	Re-blend with fresh carbon; second verified thermophilic cycle	Mandatory for C-1 destination. The stage that makes the poultry integration safe.
K-6	Final cure	Worms re-introduced; stabilization to maturity	Maturity testing before use per §10.2. Immature compost damages roots.

Table I-4. *Compost process sequence. K-5 is the stage most likely to be skipped under time pressure and is the one that cannot be.*

7.4 Absolute Exclusions From the Compost Stream

- Material from any Appendix H sequestration station, without exception. That material is contaminated by design and its destination is the H disposition routes, never a growing medium.
- Material from any Tier III source water per Appendix E §6 where the resulting compost is destined for a food crop container.
- Any material failing the contaminant screen in Section 9.

8. Poultry Constraints

8.1 The Birds Are Inside the Appendix E Protocol

Poultry on these piles eat system biomass — duckweed, algae, invertebrates raised on system residues. That places the birds squarely inside the Appendix E feed qualification protocol, and it is not optional.

The consequences are structural and constrain siting rather than operations:

- Source water tier governs. A Tier III site cannot run poultry on its compost if the eggs or birds enter the food supply. The biomass the birds are eating is feed, and Tier III biomass is not feed-eligible.
- Metals biomagnify along a four-step chain, and the worms are the step most likely to be overlooked. Earthworms are standard biomonitors for soil contamination precisely because they concentrate cadmium and lead from their substrate, and in this design they are a deliberate protein ration. The route is compost → worm → hen → egg, with a concentration step at every arrow. Worm tissue is a screening point in its own right, not only egg and bird tissue.
- Pathogen and residue screening per Appendix E §10 applies to the biomass the birds consume.
- The full Appendix E disposition logic applies: where the biomass fails feed qualification, the birds do not eat it, and the poultry stage is unavailable on that site.

A site running Appendix H, or drawing Tier III water for its Appendix G fiber crop, may still compost — but it composts without birds, and the pile is turned mechanically.

8.2 Avian Influenza Biosecurity

Open Nutrient Water Attracts Waterfowl. Waterfowl Are the Reservoir.

Wild waterfowl are the natural reservoir for avian influenza viruses. This framework builds open, warm, nutrient-rich, vegetated water bodies — which is to say, excellent waterfowl habitat — and this appendix proposes keeping poultry adjacent to them.

That combination is a recognized high-risk configuration and it must be designed against rather than discovered. Wire Quonset enclosure per §5.1 excludes wild birds from the paddocks themselves, which is the primary control. Separation distance between poultry paddocks and open water surfaces, exclusion netting over alleys and raceways where practical, dedicated footwear and equipment between zones, and a written biosecurity protocol are all required rather than advisable.

An outbreak on a site of this kind would be a catastrophic event for the operation and a serious one for the surrounding poultry industry. This is the single largest operational risk introduced by the poultry stage.

8.3 Other Constraints

- Egg sales are regulated at state level, with requirements varying substantially by volume and by channel. On-farm consumption, farmgate sale, and wholesale are three different regulatory situations.
- Poultry welfare and stocking density in the paddock configuration must satisfy whatever certification the operation intends to claim.
- Winter operation requires a plan. Piles that stop heating in cold conditions and birds in an unheated Quonset are both manageable, but not by default.

9. Spent Media Return and the Accumulation Ratchet

As greenhouse plantings are cycled out, their container media returns to the active compost stream and is blended into a current pile. The material is aged, structured, biologically established, and an excellent inoculant — it is the highest-quality bulk input the system produces.

9.1 The Problem With a Closed Loop

Appendix F §6.4 identifies this for the coppice case; it is general. Compost made partly from bioaccumulating aquatic biomass, used as container media, returned to the pile, and made into compost again is a loop that concentrates whatever the biomass captured. Each cycle adds; nothing removes.

A closed media loop on contaminated source water is a ratchet. Dilution by fresh feedstock slows it. Only removal reverses it.

9.2 The Control Rule

- Baseline metals assay on source water before a recycling loop is established. This determines whether a closed loop is viable at the site at all.
- Periodic metals assay on finished compost, at a defined interval, tracked as a trend rather than as a pass or fail. The trend is the measurement that matters — a single result says nothing about a ratchet.

- A defined bleed-off fraction. A proportion of returning media exits the loop each cycle to the thermochemical reactor rather than to the pile, and is replaced by fresh feedstock. Sizing the bleed is a site calculation from the observed accumulation rate. ⚑ PROVISIONAL.
- An action threshold at which the loop is opened entirely and media is made from fresh feedstock only, with returning media routed to RRP5.

Tier I sites will likely find the ratchet negligible and the loop indefinitely sustainable. Tier II and Tier III sites should assume it is real until measurement says otherwise.

10. Process Control and Verification

Additive to RRP8 Axis 3. Compost quality is a claim like any other in this framework, and the standard is measurement rather than appearance.

10.1 Thermophilic Verification

- Temperature logged by probe at multiple depths and positions, not spot-checked at the surface.
- Turn count and turn dates recorded, for both K-2 and K-5.
- Time-at-temperature recorded against the standard applicable to the intended destination tier.

Operations intending to supply food-crop containers should log to a recognized process standard from the outset. Established compost process rules — sustained temperature ranges, minimum durations, and minimum turn counts for windrow and static aerated pile methods — exist in organic certification and produce safety frameworks and should be adopted directly rather than approximated. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — the applicable standard is destination- and jurisdiction-dependent.

10.2 Maturity

Immature compost is not merely less good; it actively damages roots. Continuing decomposition consumes nitrogen, depletes oxygen in the root zone, and can produce phytotoxic intermediates. In this framework the consequence is amplified, because the media is going into a container that a perennial will occupy for years.

- Maturity testing before use — germination assay at minimum, with respiration rate where available.
- Stability confirmed by absence of re-heating on turning.
- No batch enters a container until it has passed. There is no way to correct immature media under an established tree.

10.3 Contaminant Screening

Metals panel on finished compost per the trend requirement in §9.2. Pathogen indicator testing on any batch destined for C-1. Screening frequency scales with source water tier.

11. Destination Tiers

Compost is classified by where it may be used, and the classification is determined by process history and contaminant screening together.

Tier	Destination	Requirements	Notes
C-1 Food Crop	Containers growing fruiting and edible crops	Full K-1 to K-6 sequence including mandatory K-5 post-	The only tier where the sequencing problem in Section

		poultry re-heat; documented time-at-temperature; pathogen and metals screening; Tier I or II source water	7 is a genuine hazard rather than a quality question.
C-2 Non-Food	Coppice buckets, fiber crops, ornamental and structural plantings	Maturity testing and metals trend monitoring. Thermophilic phase recommended; K-5 recommended where poultry were used	The default tier for most of the framework. Mantle vermicompost configuration is fully acceptable here.
C-3 Closed Loop	Media that stays within a defined non-food pathway and never leaves it	Metals trend monitoring and bleed-off per Section 9	For Tier III sites. Material may be recycled internally but does not exit to any other use.

Table I-5. *Compost destination tiers. Tier is determined by process history and screening together — neither alone is sufficient.*

12. Potting and Inoculation

Finished compost is not media until it is inoculated. Two biological additions are made at potting rather than in the pile, and the reason is the same in both cases: thermophilic composting is designed to kill things, and it does not distinguish between pathogens and beneficial organisms.

12.1 Worms Go Back In

Red wigglers are re-introduced when compost is potted, as permanent residents of the container rather than as a processing stage.

The reasoning follows directly from the habitat logic in Appendix F §4.5. A container that must support a root relationship for a decade has one predictable failure mode: the media consolidates, aggregate structure collapses, porosity is lost, and the root zone suffocates from the inside. No amount of front-loaded compost quality prevents that, because it is a process of time rather than a defect of the starting material.

A resident worm population is continuous structural maintenance. It is the only element of the container that keeps working on the media after planting.

Containment is behavioral and follows the same mechanism as root containment in Appendix F §4.7 — worms require organic matter, rounded river rock offers none, and they stay in the bucket for exactly the reason the roots do.

12.2 Fungal Inoculation Is Matched to the Plant

Mycorrhizal inoculation is prescribed by species, and the distinction is not cosmetic. The two principal associations involve entirely different organisms and are not substitutable for one another.

Association	Framework Species	Notes
Arbuscular (AMF)	Most herbaceous and fruiting crops; black locust, catalpa, mulberry, paulownia; vetiver; most Class B fiber crops	The default across the framework. Widest commercial inoculant availability.
Ectomycorrhizal (ECM)	Oak, sweet chestnut, hazel, birch, hornbeam	Different organism, different product. AMF inoculant on an ECM host is money spent on

		nothing.
Dual AMF and ECM	Willow, poplar, cottonwood	Host both. Inoculate for both where the W-1 band is being established.
Actinorhizal plus ECM	Alder	Also hosts Frankia for nitrogen fixation. Three organisms, and the nitrogen relationship is the reason alder needs little from the water.
None applicable	Brassicaceae; duckweed, azolla, and aquatic species generally	These groups do not form the association. Inoculant spend on the alley or on floating crops is wasted.

Table I-6. *Mycorrhizal association by species group. Prescription is by host, not by preference.*

12.3 The Phosphorus Suppression Conflict

The Framework's Best Feature Works Against Its Fungal Strategy

Mycorrhizal colonization is suppressed by high phosphorus availability, and high nitrogen has a similar effect. This is not a defect — it is the point of the symbiosis. A plant that can obtain phosphorus directly has no reason to spend carbon supporting a partner that fetches it.

Section 2 of this appendix argues that the framework's phosphorus surplus is a decisive advantage over conventional recirculating aquaponics, and it is. But abundant phosphorus is also the condition under which mycorrhizal establishment fails.

The framework may therefore be simultaneously the best and the worst environment for the fungal relationship it is trying to build. This is stated as an open design question rather than resolved. The likely answer is a lean establishment window — nutrient delivery to the container managed separately and more sparingly than delivery to the channel during the colonization period, then brought to full service once the association is established. ⚑ PROVISIONAL — whether colonization survives subsequent full-nutrient service is unmeasured and is a first-order pilot question.

12.4 Inoculant Sourcing

- Viable propagule counts in commercial inoculants are notoriously variable, and a product that tests low is money spent on nothing with no visible symptom. Verification at purchase or on-site propagation from a known source is the only reliable position.
- On-site propagation from an established container is the lowest-cost route once a site has running plantings, and converts inoculation from a purchased input into an internal one.
- Species-appropriate product must be confirmed against Table I-6 before purchase, not after.

12.5 On Redundant Inoculation

A proportion of both additions will not establish. Worms will be lost in handling; a share of fungal propagules will fail to colonize; and on high-phosphorus service the colonization rate may be low regardless of how much inoculant was applied.

This is planned cost rather than waste. Both inoculations are cheap relative to the container, the plant, and the years of growth that depend on them, and both are impossible to correct once a perennial is established. Inoculating generously at potting is the only point in the container's life where the intervention is available at all.

The practical warning is the reverse of the usual one. Operators under cost pressure will identify inoculation as an obvious place to economise, because its absence produces no visible symptom for a season or more and the plant does not die — it merely never performs. An operation that keeps this margin when it is tempting to cut it will outperform one that does not, and the difference will not be attributable to anything visible at the time the decision is made.

13. Deployment Scales

13.1 Scale I-1 — Static Composting, No Poultry

Piles built, turned mechanically, worms introduced at cure. No paddocks, no birds, no rotation. Suits any site — including Tier III and Appendix H sites where poultry are unavailable per §8.1 — and is the correct starting configuration everywhere while feedstock blending is being learned.

13.2 Scale I-2 — Integrated Poultry Rotation

Full paddock sequence with Quonset enclosure, mobile coop, and the K-1 through K-6 cycle. Requires Appendix E feed qualification clearance on the biomass the birds consume, the biosecurity protocol in §8.2, and paddock count satisfying both the compost and rest intervals per §5.3.

13.3 Scale I-3 — Certified Food Crop Supply

I-2 operated to documented C-1 standard with logged process control, pathogen verification, and a maturity testing regime. This is the configuration that supports growing food in the framework, and it is the configuration in which K-5 is not negotiable.

14. What the Pilot Must Prove

- Blend ratios that actually work on this feedstock profile — the wet aquatic to dry structural carbon ratio required to sustain a thermophilic pile without matting.
- Whether a site can supply its own structural carbon, or whether coppice pairing is a practical requirement rather than a preference.
- Mantle versus sequenced worm introduction — whether a hot core and a working worm population genuinely coexist, and whether the resulting temperature gradient can be documented well enough for C-1.
- Whether the K-5 second thermophilic cycle reliably reaches and holds temperature on already-degraded material.
- Pathogen indicator results before and after K-5, which is the measurement that validates the entire poultry integration.
- Paddock rest interval required to break parasite cycles under this configuration, and whether it or compost maturation governs paddock count.
- Metals accumulation rate in the media loop by source water tier, and the bleed-off fraction required to hold it flat.
- Metals transfer into poultry tissue and eggs on Tier I and Tier II water.
- Compost maturity timeline, and whether container performance differs measurably between vermicompost-finished and thermophilic-finished media for woody perennials.

- Phosphorus content and plant availability in finished compost — the measurement that substantiates Section 2.
- Worm survival fraction through a bird-worked pile, and the bin production rate required to supply K-6 re-inoculation across the full paddock count.
- Metal transfer coefficients along the compost-to-worm-to-hen-to-egg chain per §8.1.
- Mycorrhizal colonization rate at establishment under the framework's phosphorus regime, and whether colonization persists once containers are brought to full-nutrient service.
- Whether a lean establishment window materially improves colonization, and what it costs in lost growth.
- Resident worm population survival in containers over multiple seasons, and measurable effect on media porosity and structure against an uninoculated control.

15. Provisional Status

⚑ **PROVISIONAL —** All blend ratios, temperature and duration parameters, residency and rest intervals, bleed-off fractions, and accumulation rates in this appendix are drawn from established composting and pastured poultry practice or are unestablished for this feedstock and configuration. This appendix makes claims bearing on food safety and on animal health. No process parameter in this document should be relied upon for a food safety plan, an organic certification application, or a produce safety audit without validation against the standard applicable in the operator's jurisdiction and destination market.

Closing Note

The framework argues throughout that waste is material whose use has not been designed. This appendix is that argument turned on the framework's own residue stream, and it closes the last open loop in the system: the water grows the biomass, the biomass becomes the medium, and the medium grows the next crop.

The poultry stage is the part of this design most likely to be admired and least likely to be executed correctly. Birds on a maturing pile are doing genuinely useful work — turning, fragmenting, fertilizing, and converting invertebrates into eggs at no labor cost. But they arrive after the pile has been made safe and they undo that safety on the way past. The second heat is what makes the arrangement work, and it is the stage a busy operator will skip.

Everything else here is old knowledge. The blend, the heat, the worms, the rotation, and the birds behind the herd are all practices that predate any of the technology in this series. What this appendix adds is the requirement to measure them, and the sequence that lets them run together without one quietly cancelling another.

Notes

Citations follow Chicago Notes-Bibliography style. Internal Bright Meadow Group / Cernunnos Foundation documents are cited by document title and year. Figures marked ⚑ are provisional proxies pending replacement by RRP pilot data per RRP8. Regulatory and food safety references are provided for orientation and do not constitute legal, certification, or food safety advice.

1. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRP5 — HTC/HTL Thermochemical Processing," Version 2.0. CF/BMG, 01 April 2026.*

2. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRP8 — Verification, Monitoring & Performance Certification," Version 2.0. CF/BMG, 01 April 2026.*

3. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRPe — Appendix E: Agricultural Feed Production Pathway," Version 1.0. CF/BMG, 04 August 2026. Source-water tiers and feed qualification protocol governing §8.1.*

4. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRPf — Appendix F: Coppice Pole and Rod Production," Version 1.0, §4.5 and §6. CF/BMG, 04 August 2026. Two-material logic and the compost loop.*

5. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRPh — Appendix H: Metal and Micropollutant Sequestration Pathway," Version 1.0. CF/BMG, 04 August 2026.*

6. *Rynk, R., ed., On-Farm Composting Handbook. Northeast Regional Agricultural Engineering Service, NRAES-54, 1992. C:N ratio, moisture, porosity, and windrow management references for Section 3.*

7. *U.S. Department of Agriculture, National Organic Program, 7 CFR §205.203. Compost process requirements including C:N range, temperature range, duration, and turning frequency.*

8. *U.S. Food and Drug Administration, Standards for the Growing, Harvesting, Packing, and Holding of Produce for Human Consumption, 21 CFR Part 112, Subpart F. Biological soil amendments of animal origin. Basis for the C-1 tier requirements in Section 11.*

9. *Dominguez, J. and Edwards, C.A., "Biology and Ecology of Earthworm Species Used for Vermicomposting," in Vermiculture Technology, ed. Edwards, C.A., Arancon, N.Q., and Sherman, R. CRC Press, 2011. Eisenia fetida temperature tolerance underlying §4.2.*

10. *Salatin, J., Pastured Poultry Profits. Polyface, 1993. Mobile housing and rotational paddock practice underlying Section 5.*

11. *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Defend the Flock biosecurity program materials. Basis for §8.2.*

12. *Rakocy, J.E., Masser, M.P., and Losordo, T.M., "Recirculating Aquaculture Tank Production Systems: Aquaponics — Integrating Fish and Plant Culture." Southern Regional Aquaculture Center Publication 454, 2006. Phosphorus limitation in recirculating systems referenced in Section 2.*

13. *Bright Meadow Group, "RRP Field Documentation Kit," Forms A, B, and C. CF/BMG, 2026.*