

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.

Remediation of New Zealand sheep dip sites using biochar and phytoextraction technologies

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in Soil Science

Institute of Agriculture and Environment

College of Sciences, Massey University

Palmerston North, New Zealand

Samuel Gregory

2013

ABSTRACT

The practice of sheep dipping, which subjected livestock to inorganic and organic agricultural pesticides to eradicate pests such as lice and keds, is a historic practice; sheep dipping is no longer practiced in New Zealand today. Animals would be submerged in solid structures known as dips containing chemicals such as arsenicals and organochlorines with the leftover solution pumped onto surrounding soil. The use of pesticides such as these is now banned by law due to their persistence in the environment. Today an estimated 50,000 contaminated sheep dip sites exist in New Zealand representing perhaps the countries' most significant, but understated, environmental challenge.

To determine whether this historic agricultural practice had led to contamination of the environment, an investigation into the extent of contamination resulting from sheep dipping at a known historic dip site in Te Mahia, New Zealand was carried out. Characterisation of the site by arsenic soil concentration mapping revealed that 500 m² of agricultural land has been contaminated with this metalloid and that arsenic exists at varying high concentrations through the soil profile. Environmental risk from these historic pesticides was established by analysing plant and water samples below the dip site. Staple Maori food varieties such as watercress were significantly contaminated with arsenic while water samples taken from the stream below the dip returned spiked arsenic concentrations. Based on this, it was justified that arsenic/organochlorine contamination would need to be managed to reduce their effect on these food sources. The design of a coupled remediation strategy using phytoextraction and biochar was utilized to reduce remediation times and is the basis of this thesis.

Contaminated soil from the site was removed and amended with two types of biochar produced from willow feedstock. These biochars, known as 350°C and 550°C biochar were added into the soil at application rates of 30 t ha⁻¹ and 60 t ha⁻¹. During a series of 180 d glasshouse trials, the phytoextraction of arsenic into *Lolium perenne* (ryegrass) shoot tissue was analysed along with growth parameters of shoot and root biomass and corresponding response to arsenic at the molecular level. In soil; microbial activity,

soil bacterial community, organochlorine concentration, and element dynamics were analysed as a function of biochar amendment.

Soil microbial activity, analysed using the dehydrogenase assay (DHA), was significantly increased ($P < 0.01$) under all biochar treatments compared to the control after 180 d during two glasshouse trials. Metagenomic analysis of the soil bacterial community revealed that biochar amended soils were selecting for bacterial species such as *Chryseobacterium*, *Flavobacterium* and *Dyadobacter* and the family *Pseudomonadaceae* which are known bioremediators of hydrocarbons. This resulted in isomers of the organochlorine hexachlorocyclohexane (HCH), particularly alpha-HCH and gamma-HCH (lindane), undergoing 10-fold and 4-fold reductions in soil concentrations respectively (2.2 mg kg^{-1} and 0.4 mg kg^{-1}) compared to the control (25 mg kg^{-1} and 1.6 mg kg^{-1} respectively). Amendment of soil with both biochars also caused a significant reduction ($P < 0.01$) in soil DDT levels.

Biochar promoted a 2-fold increase in shoot dry weight (DW) and a 3-fold increase in root DW after 180 d during one glasshouse trial while during the second trial only ryegrass root biomass was significantly increased as a function of biochar amendment. This increase was attributed, at least in part, to the fertility value of biochar. No negative effect of biochar amendments on ryegrass germination was observed. All biochar amendments resulted in significant increases in arsenic concentrations within ryegrass shoot material. Through extrapolation, 350°C biochar amended soils was estimated to have the potential to increase ryegrass sward DW growth by 0.68 t ha^{-1} compared to ryegrass grown on unamended soils and would correspond to an increase in the extraction of total arsenic by $14,000 \text{ mg ha}^{-1}$ compared to unamended soils and in doing so decrease soil remediation times by over 50 %.

Increased arsenic uptake as a function of biochar amendment resulted in increased enzymic activity of components of the antioxidant pathway including SOD and APX in most biochar treatments but across all treatments a reduction in GPX activity was observed. Analysis of specific metabolites utilizing metabolomics also suggest a definitive metabolite profile under biochar amendment compared to contaminated

control ryegrass samples. However, there was no significant difference ($P < 0.05$) in chlorophyll content in response to the total arsenic concentration in ryegrass shoot tissue grown on contaminated soil. The observed increases in activity of SOD, APX and steady CAT activity is suggested to be efficiently catalysing the production of harmful ROS in this soil.

A 6-month field investigation into the effect of biochar amendment on the extraction of arsenic into a high biomass crop (*Salix sp*) resulted in significant increases of arsenic in stem biomass as a function of biochar amendment. When data was extrapolated to predict results of a long-term field trial and scale under willow treatment (stem) it was calculated that over 67.7 g of arsenic could be extracted in soils amended with 350°C biochar compared to 5.9 g extracted under control treatment. This could result - assuming a similar rate of extraction with time - in levels of arsenic concentration in soils reaching background concentrations in as little as 6 years, a reduction in remediation times of 92%.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research detailed within this thesis could not have been completed without the support of a number of people. My sincerest gratitude goes to Dr Chris Anderson, Professor Michael McManus and Associate Professor Marta Camps for their knowledge and help over a multitude of different aspects relating to plant-soil interactions. I truly appreciate your time and expertise.

I would also like to acknowledge Jack Bowen (farm manager) for allowing continued access on the farm and always supporting the scientific nature of the research within this thesis.

I have been part of a number of lab groups over the past three years and would like to thank those that have helped along the way. To lab members of MTM, particularly Susanna Leung for technical guidance, I have thoroughly appreciated all the help you have given me. Soil Science Lab members; coming from a genetic and plant background, I struggled with the techniques carried out at first in your lab so my biggest thank you is to Bob Toes, Ian Furkert and Ross Wallace for their time. I would also like to mention Tao Wang and Roberto Calvelo-Pereira for their time in regards to biochar analysis. Thanks also to my friends at Massey, particularly Leigh, Matt, and Todd for your support, both at home and during glasshouse trials.

My studies were supported by a Ti Tipu Putaiao Fellowship, funded by the Ministry of Science and Innovation and I am also grateful for further travel support from both the Institute of Fundamental Sciences and Institute of Agriculture and Environment.

I am deeply grateful to my family for always supporting my ambitions in life, even though I have spent the good part of a decade in constant student-related poverty. Last but not least, to my wife Kate, for your constant support and help through the last three years has been immeasurable. I love you and you are my rock.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IX
LIST OF TABLES	XIX
LIST OF FIGURES	XXIII
ABBREVIATIONS	XXIX
CHAPTER 1 : INTRODUCTION	2
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Research Objectives.....	4
1.3 Thesis Outline.....	5
CHAPTER 2 : LITERATURE REVIEW	8
2.1 History and Dipping Practice	9
2.1.1 History of Sheep Dipping.....	9
2.1.2 Dipping Practices	10
2.1.3 Chemicals Used and Likely Contamination	13
2.1.4 Organochlorines and Their Use in Dip Solution	14
2.1.5 Arsenic and its Use in Dip Solution.....	14
2.1.6 Likely Contamination Zones Surrounding Dip Sites	15
2.2 Organochlorines and the Environment.....	17
2.2.1 Organochlorine Use and NZ Sheep Dipping	17
2.2.2 Breakdown of Organochlorine Pesticides	19

2.2.3 DDT Breakdown	19
2.2.4 Lindane Breakdown (γ – HCH)	20
2.2.5 Aldrin and Dieldrin Breakdown	23
2.2.6 Effects of Pesticides on Microbial Communities	23
2.3 Biochar	25
2.3.1 Biochar and the Environment.....	26
2.3.2 Biochar Production and its Indirect Effects in Soil	27
2.3.3 Biochar and Soil Micro-organisms.....	28
2.3.4 Biochar and its Interaction with Pesticides	29
2.3.5 Biochar and its Interaction with Heavy Metals	29
2.4 Arsenic	30
2.4.1 Arsenic Background Concentrations	31
2.4.2 Anthropogenic Influence on Arsenic Concentration	31
2.4.3 Agricultural Interest in Arsenic.....	32
2.4.4 Arsenic in Aquatic Environments.....	34
2.4.5 Health Effects and Human Exposure to Arsenic.....	34
2.4.6 Arsenic Speciation in the Environment	35
2.4.7 Interacting Factors of Soil Properties	37
2.5 Phytoremediation.....	39
2.5.1 Division of the Term Phytoremediation	39
2.5.2 Phytoextraction	40
2.5.3 Arsenic Uptake Processes.....	41
2.5.4 Phytoextraction of Arsenic	42

2.5.5 Arsenic Hyperaccumulators.....	44
2.6 Stress Response and the Antioxidant Pathway	46
2.6.1 Components of the Antioxidant Pathway	47
2.7 Specific Research Objectives	49
CHAPTER 3 : MATERIALS AND METHODS	52
3.1 Biochar and Associated Analytical Procedures.....	53
3.1.1 Feedstock and Pyrolysis Conditions	53
3.1.2 Elemental and Compositional Analysis	54
3.2 Soil Analytical Procedures.....	55
3.2.1 Arsenic Analysis	55
3.2.1.1 <i>Total Soil Arsenic.....</i>	<i>55</i>
3.2.1.2 <i>Water-Extractable Arsenic.....</i>	<i>56</i>
3.2.2 Organochlorine Analysis	56
3.2.3 Dehydrogenase Activity (DHA)	56
3.2.4 Soil Bacterial Community Structure and Diversity	57
3.2.4.1 <i>Sample extraction for metagenomic analysis</i>	<i>57</i>
3.2.4.2 <i>PCR amplification.....</i>	<i>57</i>
3.2.4.3 <i>Sequencing preparation</i>	<i>58</i>
3.2.4.4 <i>Sequence analysis.....</i>	<i>58</i>
3.3 Plant Analytical Procedures	59
3.3.1 Plant Growth Analysis.....	59

3.3.2 Arsenic Analysis	59
CHAPTER 4 : SITE CHARACTERISATION	62
4.1 Site Locality and History.....	63
4.2 Soil Description and Characteristics	68
4.3 Soil Arsenic Mapping On-Site	68
4.3.1 Contamination at 0-7.5 cm Depth.....	68
4.3.2 Contamination at 7.5-15 cm Depth.....	68
4.3.3 Contamination at 15-30 cm Depth.....	69
4.4 Organochlorine Contamination	73
4.5 Effects on Food and Water Sources	74
4.6 Site Characterisation Discussion and Conclusion	74
CHAPTER 5 : BIOCHAR ENHANCES SOIL MICROBIAL ACTIVITY AND DEGRADATION OF ORGANOCHLORINES IN A CO-CONTAMINATED SOIL	78
5.1 Abstract.....	79
5.2 Keywords	79
5.3 Introduction	80
5.4 Glasshouse Setup	81
5.4.1 Soil Sampling.....	81
5.5 Results	82
5.5.1 Properties of Biochars	82
5.5.2 Soil Properties at the End of the Experiment.....	82
5.5.3 Dehydrogenase Activity.....	84

5.5.4 Biochar Amendment of Soil and its Effect on Microbial Composition.....	85
5.5.5 Concentration of Organochlorines and Arsenic in Soil at the end of Experiment	85
5.5.5.1 Organochlorines	88
5.5.5.2 Arsenic	88
5.6 Discussion	89
5.6.1 Effect of Biochar on Soil Properties and H ₂ O-Extractable Arsenic	89
5.6.2 Stimulation of Microbial Activity Under Biochar Amendment .	89
5.6.3 Key Organochlorines Degraded as a Function of Biochar Amendment.....	97
5.6.4 Possible Mechanisms for Organochlorine Reduction	99
5.7 Conclusion.....	100
CHAPTER 6 : RESPONSE OF PLANT AND SOIL MICROBES TO BIOCHAR AMENDMENT OF AN ARSENIC CONTAMINATED SOIL	102
6.1 Abstract.....	103
6.2 Keywords	104
6.3 Introduction	104
6.4 Glasshouse Setup	106
6.4.1 Ryegrass Growth Trial.....	106
6.4.2 Soil Sampling	107
6.5 Results	107

6.5.1 Biochar Properties and Characteristics	107
6.5.2 Effect of Biochar Amendment on Soil Nutrient Properties.....	108
6.5.3 Effect of Biochar on Water-extractable Arsenic.....	108
6.5.4 Soil Dehydrogenase Activity	108
6.5.5 Ryegrass Germination	109
6.5.6 Ryegrass Dry Weight (biomass).....	113
6.5.7 Ryegrass Tillering.....	114
6.5.8 Arsenic Concentration in Ryegrass Shoot Biomass	115
6.6 Discussion	116
6.6.1 Biochar Stimulates Soil Dehydrogenase Activity.....	117
6.6.2 Manipulation of Ryegrass Growth with Biochar Additions.....	118
6.5.3 Biochar Increased Arsenic Uptake in Ryegrass Shoot Tissue ..	119
6.6.4 Application of an Integrated Biochar and Phytoextraction Strategy to Remediate Sheep Dip Sites.....	120
6.7 Conclusion.....	122
CHAPTER 7 : FIELD AMENDMENT OF ARSENIC CONTAMINATED SOIL WITH BIOCHAR : EFFECT ON MICROBIAL ACTIVITY AND PHYTOEXTRACTION	125
7.1 Abstract.....	126
7.2 Keywords	127
7.3 Introduction	127
7.4 Field Trial Setup.....	128
7.4.1 Soil Sampling.....	128

7.5 Site Selection and Pre-Treatment.....	129
7.6 Results	134
7.6.1 Biochar Properties and Characteristics	134
7.6.2 Effect of Biochar on Selected Soil Properties (water-soluble arsenic, soil pH)	134
7.6.3 Soil Dehydrogenase Activity	137
7.6.4 Effect of Biochar on Arsenic Concentration in Plant Tissue	137
7.7 Discussion	140
7.7.1 Distribution of Arsenic at the Site under Study	140
7.7.2 Changes of Soil Microbial Activity	141
7.7.3 Changes in Plant-Arsenic Dynamics.....	143
7.7.4 Management and Remediation of Sheep Dip Sites using Phytoextraction-Biochar Coupling	144
7.8 Conclusion.....	146
CHAPTER 8 : ANALYSIS OF ANTIOXIDANT AND METABOLITE PROFILES IN LOLIUM PERENNE	147
8.1 Chapter Background	148
8.2 Introduction to Plant Response Mechanisms to Arsenic	148
8.2.1 ROS and the Antioxidant Pathway	149
8.2.2 Plant Metabolomics.....	150
8.3 Materials and Methods.....	151
8.3.1 Plant Materials and Growth Conditions	151

8.3.2 Ryegrass Harvesting.....	151
8.3.3 Chlorophyll Content.....	151
8.3.4 Enzyme Analysis.....	152
8.3.4.1 SOD Enzymatic Assay.....	152
8.3.4.2 CAT Enzymatic Assay	153
8.3.4.3 APX Enzymatic Assay	153
8.3.4.4 GPX Enzymatic Assay.....	154
8.3.5 Metabolomic Analysis	154
8.2.5.1 Method of Detection for C18 Streams.....	154
8.3.5.2 Method of Detection for HILIC Streams.....	155
8.3.5.3 Data Extraction and Multivariate Analysis	156
8.4 Results	157
8.4.1 Biochar Properties and Effect on Soil Elemental Status.....	157
8.4.2 Soil Dehydrogenase Activity	158
8.4.3 Ryegrass Dry Weight (DW) Biomass	158
8.4.4 Ryegrass Tillering	159
8.4.5 Arsenic Concentration in Ryegrass Shoot Biomass	160
8.4.6 Chlorophyll Content of Ryegrass Shoot.....	160
8.4.7 Analysis of Ryegrass Shoot Enzyme Activity.....	160
8.4.7.1 SOD Activity	166
8.4.7.2 CAT Activity.....	166

8.4.7.3 APX Activity.....	168
8.4.7.4 GPX Activity	168
8.4.8 Metabolomic Analysis of C18 Streams.....	173
8.4.9 Metabolomic Analysis of HILIC Streams.....	179
8.5 Discussion	185
8.5.1 Effect on Growth and Enzymic Components of the Antioxidant Pathway	185
8.5.2 Metabolite Profiling in Response to Soil Amendment.....	187
8.5.3 Conclusion	188
 CHAPTER 9 : GENERAL DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THIS RESEARCH	 191
9.1 Overview of the Current Research	192
9.2 Discussion of Research Objectives.....	192
9.2.1 Analysis of Soil Microbial Activity and Microbial Community.	193
9.2.2 Degradation of Organochlorines as a Function of Biochar Amendment.....	194
9.2.3 Effect of Biochar Amendment on Soil Properties and Plant Growth	194
9.2.4 Plant Response to Arsenic as a Function of Biochar Amendment of Soil	195
9.2.4.1 Significance of Arsenic-Phosphate Interactions at the Study Site	195
9.3 Research Summary	197

9.4 Relevance of This Research to a Remediation Strategy for Co-contaminated Sheep-Dip Sites : Recommendations	198
CHAPTER 10 : REFERENCES	203
APPENDIX A	234

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. Chemicals used to treat sheep for parasite control since 1840.....	13
Table 2.2. Soil guideline values for the protection of ecological receptors. Modified from (Ministry for the Environment, 2006) values in mg kg ⁻¹	15
Table 2.3. Summary of median organochlorine pesticide concentrations in NZ soil. Concentrations are in µg kg ⁻¹ DW soil basis. na = not analysed , nc = not calculated (detected less than 66% of occasions). Table modified from : Ministry for the Environment (1998a).....	21
Table 2.4. Degradation of organochlorines by a select group of soil microorganisms and the metabolite products formed. Table modified from (Lal & Saxena, 1982).....	22
Table 2.5. Effects and symptoms linked to various concentrations of arsenic in drinking water. Modified from (Environment Waikato, 2006).	36
Table 4.1. Soil organochlorine concentrations (mg kg ⁻¹) from initial testing on-site at Te Mahia dip. (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.)	73
Table 4.2. Arsenic concentrations in water and plant samples taken from waterway below the dip site which discharges into the ocean. World Health Organisation (WHO) arsenic standards are 2 mg kg ⁻¹ for plants and 10 µg L ⁻¹ for water.	76
Table 5.1. Elemental analysis of biochar, production and characteristics.	83
Table 5.2. Chemical composition of carbon (C1s) determined through high-energy resolution XPS analysis of biochar particles.	84
Table 5.3. Elemental analysis of soil and biochar characterisation after 180 d of treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.). Cations have been depicted as extractable cations (meq/100g).....	86
Table 5.4. Metagenomic analyses from QIIME based on taxonomic structure of the soil bacterial community (%) as a function of treatment. Taxonomy is listed based on Phyla	

(Kingdom : Bacteria). Significant differences are noted by different letters (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.) compared to the control.....90

Table 5.5. Metagenomic analyses from QIIME based on taxonomic structure of the soil bacterial community (%) as a function of treatment. Selected taxonomy is based on significant changes within phyla. biochar amendment and no biochar amendment (control). Significant differences are noted by different letters (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).91

Table 5.6. Organochlorine concentrations (mg kg^{-1}) in soil as a function of treatment. Different letters corresponding to each organochlorine represent significant differences. Significant differences are noted at $P < 0.05$ (aldrin, dieldrin, δ -HCH, endrin ketone) and $P < 0.01$ (α -HCH, Lindane, Σ DDT) and are noted by different letters (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).....92

Table 5.7. Water extractable arsenic (mg L^{-1}) in soil as a function of treatment. Significant differences are denoted by different letters at $P < 0.05$ (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.). Soil pH values are listed in italics and in brackets for each treatment.95

Table 5.8. 4,4'-DDT and its breakdown derivative 4,4'-DDE (mg kg^{-1}) as a function of treatment after $T = 180$. A ratio between DDE:DDT in soil after treatment is also included. Significant errors are listed after the mean with all samples (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).96

Table 6.1. Elemental analysis of soil and biochar characterisation after 180 d of treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.). Cations have been depicted as extractable cations ($\text{meq}/100\text{g}$).....110

Table 6.2. Water extractable arsenic (mg L^{-1}) in soil as a function of treatment. Significant differences are denoted by different letters at $P < 0.05$ (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.). Soil pH values are listed in italics and in brackets for each treatment.111

Table 7.1. Elemental analysis of biochar, production and characteristics.133

Table 7.2. Chemical composition of carbon (C1s) determined through high-energy resolution XPS analysis of fresh biochar particles ($T = 0$).136

Table 7.3. Soil physico chemical properties at (T = 0) in control soil. (mean $n = 36$; \pm s.e.)	136
Table 7.4. Selected soil properties including water extractable arsenic (mg L^{-1}) and pH in soil as a function of treatment (at T= 0 and 180 d). Significant differences are denoted by different letters at $P < 0.05$ (mean $n = 12$; \pm s.e.)	137
Table 7.5. Analysis of climate parameters in the area (Mahia, New Zealand) including temperature (max, min $^{\circ}\text{C}$) and rainfall (mm) during the time period of the field trial (mean $n = 36$; \pm s.e.)	142
Table 8.1. Elemental analysis of soil and biochar characterisation after 180 d of treatment (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$). Cations have been depicted as extractable cations (meq/100g).	161

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1. Ring bath or pot dip in use	11
Figure 2.2. Disused and dilapidated ring bath	11
Figure 2.3. A swim dip showing immersion of stock.....	12
Figure 2.4. Sheep shower unit in use	12
Figure 2.5. A sketch of a typical swim dip site with related structures (Ministry for the Environment, 2006).....	16
Figure 2.6. The primary breakdown pathway of DDT and its derivatives by soil microorganisms. Main pathways include reductive dechlorination and dehydrochlorination and can also be assisted by thermal means. Figure modified from (Lal & Saxena, 1982).	20
Figure 2.7. Oxidation-reduction conversion reaction between aldrin and dieldrin observed in the environment.....	23
Figure 2.8. Major sources of arsenic by anthropogenic and natural processes. Modified form Mahimairaja et al. (2005)	33
Figure 4.1. Site location of the studied dip site on the Mahia Peninsula, East Coast, North Island, NZ.....	64
Figure 4.2. A representation of the historic structures that are no longer on-site as viewed by Google Earth. The dip itself is represented by the upside-down T with associated holding pens and shearing sheds to the right and below of the dip.	65
Figure 4.3. Inferred location of the now covered dip site at Te Mahia. Dip features have been completely destroyed.....	66
Figure 4.4. Sampling source map at Te Mahia site. Soil used for initial organochlorine and arsenic testing (Table 4.1) and subsequent glasshouse trials (Chapter 5, 6 and 8) was removed from the yellow sampling point. All other sampling points are as noted:	

Blue cross (water and watercress sampling, Table 4.2); Red cross (field trial site, Chapter 7); Green cross (uncontaminated control soil, Chapter 8).....67

Figure 4.5. Soil total arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) at 0-7.5 cm depth. The outline of the dip and drainage pad has been inlayed with major divisions representing 10 m. ...70

Figure 4.6. Soil total arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) at 7.5-15 cm depth. The outline of the dip and drainage pad has been inlayed with major divisions representing 10 m. ...71

Figure 4.7. Soil total arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) at 15-30 cm depth. The outline of the dip and drainage pad has been inlayed with major divisions representing 10 m. ...72

Figure 5.1. Soil dehydrogenase activity measured in μg per g of dry matter (DM) as a function of A) 350 °C biochar treatment and B) 550 °C biochar treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).87

Figure 5.2. Soil concentrations (mg kg^{-1}) for A) Alpha-HCH B) Lindane C) DDT and D) Delta-HCH at the termination of the glasshouse trial under different treatments. Significant differences are observed between all biochar types and the control ($P < 0.01$) (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).93

Figure 6.1. Soil dehydrogenase activity measured in μg per g of dry matter (DM) as a function of 350°C and 550°C biochar treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).112

Figure 6.2. Ryegrass seed germination (%) between 0 and 20 d after seeding onto soil amended with both 350°C and 550°C biochar at two rates (30t ha^{-1} and 60t ha^{-1}) . The control soil is soil not amended with biochar.113

Figure 6.3. Averaged ryegrass DW (g) yield at harvest ($T = 180$ d) as a function of biochar treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).....114

Figure 6.4. Average number of ryegrass tillers per pot as a function of biochar treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).....115

Figure 6.5. Total average arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) in ryegrass shoot biomass as a function of biochar treatment (mean $n = 3$; \pm s.e.).....116

Figure 7.1. 2-D isocontour map depicting the heterogeneity of soil arsenic within the 10 x 10 m grid localised to the left of the actual dip. High arsenic concentrations (mg kg^{-1}) are relative to the proximity from the dip itself which is situated to the west. The three plots used for the trial are situated to the east.....130

Figure 7.2. A) Observation of the initial field trial setup T = 1 d. The initial three grids can be observed. B) Observation of the initial field trial setup T = 1 d. Randomisation can be observed in one of the three grids showing sub-plots. C) Observation of the field trial setup T = 30 d. D) Observation of the field trial setup T = 90 d. E) Observation of the field trial setup T = 180 d.131

Figure 7.3. Change in dehydrogenase activity (DHA) in $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ DM (dry matter) between sampling points for the three treatments. Changes are relative to the previous sampling point (mean $n = 12$; \pm s.e.)138

Figure 7.4. Total average arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) in willow leaf and stem biomass as a function of biochar treatment. * Denotes a significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between treatments (mean $n = 12$; \pm s.e.)139

Figure 7.5. Total average arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) in *Pteris cretica* leaf lamina and stem biomass as a function of biochar treatment. *Denotes a significant difference ($P < 0.05$) between treatments (mean $n = 12$; \pm s.e.)140

Figure 8.1. Production of ROS and their catalysation to form water by non enzymic and enzymic components.....150

Figure 8.2. Change in soil dehydrogenase activity, measured in μg per g of dry matter (DM), over a 180 d time period as a function of two 550°C biochar treatments and uncontaminated and contaminated controls (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).162

Figure 8.3. Change in soil dehydrogenase activity, measured in μg per g of dry matter (DM), over a 180 d time period as a function of two 350°C biochar treatments and uncontaminated and contaminated controls (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).162

Figure 8.4. Glasshouse setup of amended soil pots containing growing ryegrass plants (T = 90 d).....	163
Figure 8.5. Averaged ryegrass shoot DW (g) yield at harvest (T = 180 d) as a function of control and biochar treatment (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	164
Figure 8.6. Averaged ryegrass root DW (g) yield at harvest (T = 180 d) as a function of control and biochar treatment (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	164
Figure 8.7. Average number of ryegrass tillers per plant as a function of biochar treatment (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	165
Figure 8.8. Total average arsenic concentration (mg kg^{-1}) in ryegrass shoot biomass as a function of biochar treatment (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	165
Figure 8.9. Chlorophyll content of the excised 2 nd flag leaf of ryegrass samples grown under different treatments at 90 d and 180 d (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	167
Figure 8.10. SOD activity of the excised 2 nd flag leaf of ryegrass samples grown under different treatments at 90 d and 180 d (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	169
Figure 8.11. CAT activity of the excised 2 nd flag leaf of ryegrass samples grown under different treatments at 90 d and 180 d (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	170
Figure 8.12. APX activity of the excised 2 nd flag leaf of ryegrass samples grown under different treatments at 90 d and 180 d (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	171
Figure 8.13. GPX activity of the excised 2 nd flag leaf of ryegrass samples grown under different treatments at 90 d and 180 d (values are mean \pm s.e. $n = 5$).....	172
Figure 8.14. Score plot between the selected principal components (PCs) for C18 Negative (Left) and C18 Positive (Right). Variances are shown in brackets on each axis.	174

Figure 8.15. 3D score plot between the selected principal components (PCs) for C18 Negative (Left) and C18 Positive (Right). Variances are shown in brackets on each axis.175

Figure 8.16. Important features (calculated by their difference among treatments) identified by PLS-DA for C18 Negative. The coloured boxes on the right indicate the relative concentrations of the corresponding metabolite in each group under study.176

Figure 8.17. Important features (calculated by their difference among treatments) identified by PLS-DA for C18 Positive. The coloured boxes on the right indicate the relative concentrations of the corresponding metabolite in each group under study.177

Figure 8.18. Clustering result shown as heatmap for C18 Negative (Left) and C18 Positive (Right). Metabolites (blue) represent downregulation and metabolites (red) are upregulated178

Figure 8.19. Score plot between the selected principal components (PCs) HILIC Negative (Left) and HILIC Positive (Right). Variances are shown in brackets on each axis.180

Figure 8.20. 3D plot between the selected principal components (PCs) HILIC Negative (Left) and HILIC Positive (Right). Variances are shown in brackets on each axis.181

Figure 8.21. Important features (calculated by their difference among treatments) identified by PLS-DA for HILIC Negative. The coloured boxes on the right indicate the relative concentrations of the corresponding metabolite in each group under study.182

Figure 8.22. Important features (calculated by their difference among treatments) identified by PLS-DA for HILIC Positive. The coloured boxes on the right indicate the relative concentrations of the corresponding metabolite in each group under study.183

Figure 8.23. Clustering result shown as heatmap for HILIC Negative (Left) and HILIC Positive (Right). Metabolites (blue) represent downregulation and metabolites (red) are upregulated184

Figure 9.1. Flowchart depicting eventual closed loop remediation system for biochar-phytoextraction treatment of historic sheep dip soil201

ABBREVIATIONS

AAS	Atomic Absorption Spectrometry
AOAC	Association of Analytical Communities
APX	Ascorbate Peroxidase
ARML	AgResearch Metabolomic Laboratory
As	Arsenic
ATP	Adenosine-5'-Triphosphate
BET	Brunauer–Emmett–Teller
bp	Base Pair
°C	Degrees Celsius
CaCO₃	Calcium Carbonate
CAT	Catalase
CEC	Cation Exchange Capacity
cm	Centimetre
C_{org}	Organic Carbon
d	Day
DDD	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethane
DDE	Dichlorodiphenyldichloroethylene
DDT	Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane
DHA	Dehydrogenase Activity
DM	Dry Matter
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid
DW	Dry Weight
DTT	Dithiothreitol
EDTA	Ethylenediaminetetraacetic Acid
eV	Electronvolt
FIAS	Flow Injection Atomic Spectroscopy

FW	Fresh Weight
GC-MS	Gas Chromatography – Mass Spectrometry
GFAAS	Graphite Furnace Atomic Absorption Spectrometry
GPX	Guaiacol Peroxidase
H₂O₂	Hydrogen Peroxide
HCH	Hexachlorocyclohexane
H/C_{org}	Hydrogen / Organic Carbon Ratio
HILIC	Hydrophilic Interaction Liquid Chromatography
HNO₃	Nitric Acid
hr	Hour
IAA	Indole-3-acetic Acid
K₂PO₄	Potassium Phosphate
KI	Potassium Iodide
LC-MS	Liquid Chromatography – Mass Spectrometry
M	Molar
Meq	Milliequivalents
min	Minute
mL	Milli Litres
mmol	Millimoles
MQ	Milli Q
mV	Milli Volts
N₂	Nitrogen
NaCl	Sodium Chloride
NBT	Nitro-blue Tetrazolium
ng	Nanogram
O/N	Overnight
PC	Phytochelatin

PCA	Principal Component Analysis
PCR	Polymerase Chain Reaction
PGPR	Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria
PLS-DA	Partial Least Squares - Discriminant Analysis
ROS	Reactive Oxygen Species
rpm	Revolutions Per Minute
s.e	Standard Error
SOD	Superoxide Dismutase
sp.	Species
TGA	Thermogravimetric Analysis
t ha⁻¹	Tonnes per Hectare
WHC	Water Holding Capacity
WHO	World Health Organisation
w/v	Weight to Volume
w/w	Weight to Weight
XPS	X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy