

CALIFORNIA STATE SCIENCE FAIR 2011 PROJECT SUMMARY

| Name(s) | Project Number |
|--|--|
| | |
| Samuel Z. Lang | |
| | |
| | 31498 |
| Project Title | |
| A Comparison of the Effects of Household Wastes vs. Commercial | |
| Bedding in Vermiculture on E. fetida and L. rubellus | |
| | |
| Abstract | |
| Objectives/Goals | S / S |
| When you start raising worms, which food / bedding sho | ould you choose? According p many online |
| articles, worms can be fed on many things including paper, coffee and tea. By using pure food as bedding. I studied the effects of common household wastes vs. common sial bedding in vermiculture on F | |
| bedding, I studied the effects of common household wastes vs. compensial bedding in vermiculture on E. fetida and L. rubellus, in order to find out which household wastes preserves as well as encourages the | |
| most worm growth. My hypothesis is: peat moss would be most effective in both preserving vitality and | |
| promoting growth, but inexpensive alternative(s) could be found in the Household Wastes category. | |
| Methods/Materials Putting worms into a variety of pure food jars (no other bed ing) wer a period of time, observing worms# | |
| health condition, and measuring their weight changes. | |
| Tested foods: pea moss, shredded paper, coffee grounds, used tea leaver, and etc. | |
| Tested worm species: Eisenia fetida and Lumbricus rubellus | |
| Results | |
| Peat moss produced the best results, with paper finishing closely behind; then followed by coffee, teas were the worst. | |
| Conclusions/Discussion // // | |
| The pilot study supported my hypothesis that year moss would be most effective in both preserving vitality and promoting growth, but inexpensive alternative(2) does exist in the Household Wastes category, such as shredded paper. In addition, I learned that moisture is a powerful variable, and teas may | |
| vitality and promoting growth, but inexpensive alternative(3) does exist in the Household Wastes | |
| category, such as shredded paper. In addition, learned that moisture is a powerful variable, and teas may be potential worm poison. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Summary Statement | |
| By raising works invariety of pure foods, I conducted this project to compare the effects of household | |
| wastes vs. commercial bedding in vermiculture on E. fetida and L. rubellus. | |
| | |
| | |
| Help Received | |
| Parents provided moral support, advice and purchase of all materials. | |
| | |
| | |