

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

# **Nutrient Accumulation in Soils Under Long-Term Farm Dairy Effluent Application**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for

the degree of

Master of Applied Science

in

Soil Science

at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

**Juliet Cox**

**2005**

## Abstract

Land-based application of farm dairy effluent (FDE) has been encouraged by regional councils since the introduction of the resource management act (RMA) in 1991. The problems associated with FDE irrigation are high levels of nitrate in ground and surface waters which can lead to human health issues where the groundwater is used as drinking-water and environmental degradation of streams, rivers and lakes. Regional councils impose nitrogen loading limits to reduce the likelihood of environmental problems from nitrate leaching. Long-term data investigating FDE application and the associated soil changes over time is currently unavailable and the nutrient budgeting tool OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets 2 is validated against only short-term trials. Therefore, assumptions made in the model for long-term FDE application areas may not be correct.

The project investigated the soil chemical characteristics of six long-term (>6 years) farm dairy effluent paddocks and matched non-effluent paddocks in the Waikato and Bay of Plenty. Fieldwork involved the removal of five core samples from each paddock, with each core yielding six sub-samples of 75 mm depth. Soil analyses included bulk density calculations, cation exchange capacity, total carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus determination and Olsen P.

It was found that two sites had the same total cation exchange capacity in the effluent and non-effluent paddocks, but the proportions of the individual cations were different. A significant ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ) difference in the exchangeable potassium concentration existed between the pairs of paddocks with much greater potassium found in the areas irrigated with FDE. No discernable difference in the concentrations of carbon and nitrogen was found between the topsoil of the effluent and non-effluent paddocks. This was due to the highly variable nature of the effluent and the soils themselves, and the large pool of nutrients in the soil, requiring a large change before a noticeable difference occurred. The total

nitrogen and phosphorus levels found in the soil profiles (0-450 mm) of the effluent and non-effluent paddocks were very similar, and reflects the large additions of fertilisers to non-effluent paddocks.

The OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets model was used to produce nutrient budgets for farms from the Waikato and Bay of Plenty and predictions of accumulation of nutrients over time. Comparisons made between the OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> results and soil chemical analyses revealed that with the exception of potassium, it was not possible to accurately predict the nutrient concentration in the soil by extrapolation of OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> data. This was due to changes in management practices over time and the inherent variability of soils. If the model is to be used as a regulatory tool, accurate fertiliser records must be kept, along with frequent pasture and soil analysis. It is also advisable that a soil map of the farm area is completed in order to most accurately use the model.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to express my gratitude to the following people, without whom, this project would not exist:

My ever-patient supervisor Dr Mike Hedley, for his support and wisdom throughout my time at Massey.

The six farmers who believe that more knowledge enables better farming and allowed me to trample across their paddocks and scrutinise their farming practices.

The Soil and Earth Sciences Group, Institute of Natural Resources at Massey for welcoming me so warmly.

The 'famous five' in G3, thanks for keeping me sane and for all those fun and interesting conversations about everything except our theses!

My parents, for giving me a love of science and learning, and for encouraging me for all these years.

And finally, to my husband Jason, who has constantly believed in me and my ambition. All my love, always.

# Table of Contents

	Page
<b>CHAPTER 1:</b>	
Introduction.....	1
<b>CHAPTER 2:</b>	
A Review on the Composition, Influence and Effect of Farm Dairy Effluent on Soil and Issues Relating to its Application.....	4
2.1 Introduction.....	4
2.2 Composition of Farm Dairy Effluent.....	5
2.3 Influence of Farm Dairy Effluent on Soil Nutrient Concentrations.....	8
2.4 Influence of Farm Dairy Effluent on Herbage.....	8
2.5 Dung and Urine Effects.....	11
2.6 FDE Irrigation.....	13
2.7 Summary.....	21
<b>CHAPTER 3:</b>	
Materials and Methods.....	23
3.1 Site descriptions.....	23
3.2 Soil sampling.....	26
3.3 Chemical analysis.....	36
<b>CHAPTER 4:</b>	
Soil Chemical Characteristics.....	37
4.1 Introduction.....	37
4.2 Comparison of Cation Content with Depth.....	39
4.3 Carbon and Nitrogen Analysis.....	49
4.4 Comparison of Total Nitrogen Determination Techniques.....	50
4.5 Comparison of Total Nitrogen and Total Phosphorus Contents with Soil Depth.....	51
4.6 Olsen P.....	55
4.7 Summary.....	56
<b>CHAPTER 5:</b>	
OVERSEER® Nutrient Budgets.....	57
5.1 Introduction.....	57

5.2	Site Information.....	58
5.3	Block Information .....	58
5.4	Nutrient Budgets .....	60
5.5	Using OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> to predict soil nutrient status .....	72
5.6	Summary .....	78
 <b>CHAPTER 6:</b>		
	Evaluation of OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> predictions for nutrient accumulation in soil.....	80
6.1	Introduction .....	80
6.2	Methods .....	82
6.3	Results.....	84
6.4	Discussion .....	93
6.5	Conclusion.....	97
 <b>CHAPTER 7:</b>		
	Conclusion.....	99
7.1	Recommendations for Future Study and Model Improvement.....	99
7.2	General conclusions .....	100
 <b>REFERENCES .....</b>		<b>103</b>
 <b>APPENDIX ONE:</b>		
	Soil Chemical Analysis .....	114
Appendix 1.1	Summary of Soil Analyses .....	114
Appendix 1.2	Exchangeable Cation Analysis.....	137
Appendix 1.3	Total Nitrogen and Phosphorus .....	152
 <b>APPENDIX TWO:</b>		
	Site A Nutrient History .....	168
Appendix 2.1	Fertiliser Records from 1993 – 2003 for Site A.....	168
Appendix 2.2	Site A Effluent Paddock Soil Test Results .....	168
Appendix 2.3	Site A Non-Effluent Paddock Soil Test Results.....	169
Appendix 2.4	Annual Nutrient Budget Summaries.....	169
Appendix 2.5	Accumulation of Potassium at Site A .....	178

**APPENDIX THREE:**

OVERSEER® Input Parameters ..... 179

    Appendix 3.1 User-Defined General Information ..... 180

    Appendix 3.2 Effluent Block Input Variables ..... 181

    Appendix 3.3 Non-Effluent Block Input Variables ..... 182

**APPENDIX FOUR:**

Nutrient Budgets for Sites A-F ..... 183

    Appendix 4.1 Site A ..... 183

    Appendix 4.2 Site B ..... 184

    Appendix 4.3 Site C ..... 185

    Appendix 4.4 Site D ..... 186

    Appendix 4.5 Site E ..... 187

    Appendix 4.6 Site F ..... 188

**APPENDIX FIVE:**

Conversion and Accumulation Calculations ..... 189

    Appendix 5.1 Conversion of Exchangeable Cation Results ..... 189

    Appendix 5.2 Conversion of Total Nitrogen and Phosphorus ..... 196

    Appendix 5.3 Accumulation ..... 201

## List of Tables

	Page
Table 2.1: Composition of farm dairy effluent from literature sources for selected nutrients.....	5
Table 2.2: Nitrogen (N) forms found in raw farm dairy effluent from May 1996 to February 1997 .....	7
Table 2.3: Increase in pasture production (%) due to application of FDE .....	9
Table 3.1: Summary of site characteristics.....	23
Table 4.1: Total difference (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) between effluent and non-effluent paddock profiles (0-450 mm) for potassium (K <sup>+</sup> ), calcium (Ca <sup>2+</sup> ) and magnesium (Mg <sup>2+</sup> ) at all sites .....	40
Table 4.2: Carbon: Nitrogen ratio for all sites in the 0-75 mm depth .....	50
Table 4.3: Difference between effluent and non-effluent paddock soil profile results (0-450 mm) for total nitrogen (N) and total phosphorus (P) .....	54
Table 4.4: Olsen P soil test values (µg g <sup>-1</sup> ) for effluent and non-effluent paddocks .....	55
Table 5.1: Site specific parameters required by the OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budget 2 model and information from sites C and F*.....	58
Table 5.2: Input variables for the effluent areas of sites C and F .....	59
Table 5.3: Input variables for the non-effluent areas of sites C and F .....	60
Table 5.4: Nitrogen data (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets for all sites based on 2004 management practices.....	66
Table 5.5: Phosphorus data (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets for all sites based on 2004 management practices.....	67
Table 5.6: Potassium data (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets for all sites based on 2004 management practices.....	68
Table 5.7: Prediction of nitrogen and phosphorus accumulated or lost from the soil (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) by extrapolation of current OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> data over the period of effluent application .....	76

Table 5.8:	Prediction of the accumulation or loss ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) of potassium, calcium and magnesium from the soil by extrapolation of current OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> data over the period of effluent application.....	78
Table 6.1:	The calculated difference of phosphorus (P) concentrations found in the soil (effluent – non-effluent paddock) and the OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> prediction of the difference between paddocks in accumulation or loss of P .....	86
Table 6.2:	Predicted effluent application rates ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) based on OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> nutrient budget values and the average and range of effluent concentrations reported in Longhurst et al. (2000a) for nitrogen and phosphorus.....	96
Table 6.3:	Predicted rates ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) of potassium, calcium and magnesium applied annually in effluent based on OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> nutrient budget values and the average concentrations of potassium, calcium and magnesium found in effluent, reported in Longhurst et al. (2000a).....	97

## List of Plates

	Page
Plate 3.1: The effluent paddocks at Site A (left) and B (right).....	24
Plate 3.2: Effluent paddocks at sites C (left) and E (right) .....	25
Plate 3.3: Effluent paddocks at sites D (left) and F (right) .....	26
Plate 3.4: Photos of each core taken at site A. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	28
Plate 3.5: Photos of each core taken at site B. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	29
Plate 3.6: Photos of each core taken at site C. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	30
Plate 3.7: Photos of each core taken at the sandy part of site D. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	31
Plate 3.8: Photos of each core taken at the more rolling parts of site D. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	32
Plate 3.9: Photos of each core taken of the effluent paddocks at site E. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	33
Plate 3.10: Photos of each core taken of the non-effluent paddock at site E. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	34
Plate 3.11: Photos of each core taken at site F. Each core was divided into 75 mm increments, and the bulk density calculated .....	35

## List of Figures

	Page
Figure 4.1: Exchangeable cation concentrations (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> soil) in the soil profiles of effluent and non-effluent paddocks at site A .....	40
Figure 4.2: Exchangeable cation concentrations (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> soil) in the soil profiles of effluent and non-effluent paddocks at sites B and C .....	42
Figure 4.3: Exchangeable cation concentrations (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> soil) in the soil profiles of effluent and non-effluent paddocks at site D .....	44
Figure 4.4: Exchangeable cation concentrations (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> soil) in the soil profiles of effluent and non-effluent paddocks at site E .....	46
Figure 4.5: Exchangeable cation concentrations (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> soil) in the soil profiles of effluent and non-effluent paddocks at site F .....	47
Figure 4.6: Carbon (C %) and nitrogen (N %) content of topsoils (0-75 mm) measured by Leco combustion method .....	49
Figure 4.7: Nitrogen content (%) in the 0-75 mm depth, determined by two methods: total Kjeldahl nitrogen digest (TKN) and combustion (Leco) .....	51
Figure 4.8: Total nitrogen (N) and total phosphorus (P) (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) determined in the soil profile of the effluent and non-effluent paddocks at sites A-C .....	52
Figure 4.9: Total nitrogen (N) and total phosphorus (P) (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) determined in the soil profile of the effluent and non-effluent paddocks at sites D-F .....	53
Figure 5.1: Nutrient budgets from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> for the effluent (shaded) and non-effluent areas of site C .....	62
Figure 5.2: Nutrient budgets from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> for the effluent (shaded) and non-effluent areas of site F .....	63
Figure 5.3: OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> partitioning of nitrogen (N) based on nutrient source of input (effluent and fertiliser) for immobilisation (a) and leaching losses (b) across all study sites (A-F) .....	70
Figure 5.4: OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> predictions for the change in the inorganic pool of potassium (K) (a), and K leaching (b), based on nutrient source of input (effluent and fertiliser) across all study sites (A-F) .....	71

Figure 5.5:	OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> predictions for phosphorus (P) for annual absorption (a) and the net gain or loss of P to the soil (absorption + change in inorganic pool) (b) across all study sites (A-F) .....	71
Figure 5.6:	Calculated annual change in inorganic calcium (Ca) and magnesium (Mg) pools at different levels of inputs across all study sites (A-F). (Data from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> nutrient budgets) .....	72
Figure 5.7:	Accumulation of potassium (K) in the soil over the period of effluent application using OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> to predict leaching and the change in inorganic pool.....	73
Figure 5.8:	The effect of change in the potassium (K) quick test (QT) unit on the amount of K leached ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$ ) and the change in the inorganic K pool ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{yr}^{-1}$ ) for Granular, Allophanic and Podzol soils found at site B .....	75
Figure 6.1:	Nutrient budget from OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> for the effluent paddock at site B.....	83
Figure 6.2:	The difference ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) between the effluent and non-effluent paddocks for the P inputs estimated by OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> and the total soil P (to 450 mm) found by chemical analysis .....	85
Figure 6.3:	The difference ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) between the effluent and non-effluent paddocks for the OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> predictions of accumulation and the total of the actual values found in the soil (to 450 mm depth), for phosphorus (P) .....	86
Figure 6.4:	The difference (effluent – non-effluent) for the predicted amount of nitrogen (N) immobilised and the total N found in the soil .....	88
Figure 6.5:	The difference ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) between the effluent and non-effluent paddocks for the K inputs estimated by OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> and the exchangeable soil K (0- 450 mm) found by chemical analysis.....	89
Figure 6.6:	The difference ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) between the effluent and non-effluent paddocks for exchangeable soil K (0-450 mm) and the K change in inorganic pool predicted by OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> .....	89
Figure 6.7:	The potassium cycle on a dairy farm.....	90
Figure 6.8:	The difference (effluent – non-effluent) in potassium (K) inputs and the leaching losses estimated by OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> and the concentrations found in the soil profile (0-450 mm) (all values in $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) .....	91
Figure 6.9:	The difference ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) between the effluent and non-effluent paddocks for the Mg inputs estimated by OVERSEER <sup>®</sup> and the exchangeable soil Mg (to 450 mm) found by chemical analysis .....	92

## CHAPTER 1: Introduction

The intensification of dairying in NZ caused by increased herd numbers (LIC 2004) has led to a greater volume of farm dairy effluent (FDE) being produced each year. Previous management of FDE allowed its disposal to surface waters, which causes nutrient enrichment and degradation of the streams, rivers and lakes, called eutrophication.

With the introduction of the resource management act (RMA) in 1991, regional councils became more aware and accountable of the environmental effects of land management decisions and started to encourage the treatment of the FDE through the soil-plant system via land application.

The only constraint on the farmers with this new legislation is an annual maximum nitrogen loading. In the Waikato, this limit is set at  $150 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ , while in the Bay of Plenty; it is now at  $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$  (Cameron & Trenouth 1999). These limits are designed to minimise the nitrate-nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_3^-$ ) that is leached out of the system as high concentrations of  $\text{NO}_3^-$  in groundwater that is used as a drinking-water source have been linked with human health problems and to reduce the eutrophication potential in nearby streams and rivers.

Improper management of FDE systems can lead to these environmental problems and several computer programmes are available which enable farmers and consultants to estimate their annual nitrogen inputs, outputs and losses. This gives them the knowledge of the environmental consequences of some of their decisions such as timing of fertiliser application. One such computer model is OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets 2 (v. 5.0.14.0), developed by AgResearch and available for free off the internet. The assumptions and calculations made in the model have been validated against the numerous short-term fertiliser and effluent trials conducted in New

Zealand (Ledgard *et al.* 1999). The model is not, however, validated against any long-term FDE investigations. The issues involved with FDE application are not as straight-forward as fertilisers as FDE contains varying concentrations of nutrients, in a liquid form, and with a carbon source. FDE is also often applied at inappropriate times such as when the soil is saturated and when pasture growth is slow.

The general purpose of the research was to investigate the validity of using OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> to give nutrient budgets for long-term FDE paddocks as actual leaching losses and storage in the soil may be different to those predicted by OVERSEER<sup>®</sup>. This was achieved by the following objectives:

1. investigate soil chemical properties under long-term (>6 years) irrigation of FDE and compare with non-irrigated areas.
2. use data derived from the soil chemical analyses and farmer interviews to produce nutrient budgets for sites using OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> Nutrient Budgets 2 (v.5.0.14.0).
3. attempt to use phosphorus as an indicator of the quantity of nutrients applied over time and predict soil accumulation rates.
4. use OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> data to extrapolate accumulation rates and compare with the results from soil chemical analysis.
5. evaluate the performance of OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> in prediction of nutrient movement in long-term organic nutrient application situations.

Previous research into the issue and sustainability of FDE irrigation onto land has focussed on the form and concentrations of nutrients, particularly nitrogen, phosphorus and sulfur, lost from the soil profile as drainage and overland flow (Cameron *et al.* 1999; Di & Cameron 2002). Few studies have investigated the changes that occur in the soil with FDE application.

The outline of this thesis follows the standard format, with chapter 1 being a short introduction to the subject, chapter 2 containing a review of the literature pertaining to FDE and irrigation of FDE onto land and chapter 3 describing the fieldwork and soil chemical analyses undertaken. Chapters 4, 5 and 6 involve the results and discussion part of the three aspects of the project: soil chemistry, the use of OVERSEER<sup>®</sup>, and the comparison and evaluation of OVERSEER<sup>®</sup> and the soil results. Chapter 7 concludes the research with a summary and recommendations for future work.