

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.

Land Treatment of Dairy-farm Effluent Using Short Rotation Forestry

**A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy at Massey University**

Jonathan K. F. Roygard

**Massey University
New Zealand**

June 1999

Abstract

Under the Resource Management Act (1991) New Zealand dairy farmers are required to dispose of dairy-farm effluent in such a manner as to have no adverse effect on the receiving environment. This study investigated the land treatment of pond treated effluent to short rotation forestry (SRF). The study involved both field trials and modelling work to assess sustainability of these systems in terms of nitrogen leaching to groundwater.

A lysimeter study investigated 3 SRF species, 2 evergreen species of Eucalypts (*Eucalyptus saligna*, *E. nitens*) and a deciduous willow (*Salix kinuyanagi*) in the treatment of dairy farm effluent. Trees were grown in lysimeters (1.8 m diameter, 1.0 m depth) to enable measurement of water and nitrogen balances. A bare-soil treatment was used as a control. The application of dairy-farm oxidation-pond effluent totaled 218 g N lysimeter⁻¹ (equivalent to 872 kg N ha⁻¹) over 2 irrigation seasons (December 1995-June 1996 and September 1996-April 1997). Effluent was applied weekly during the irrigation seasons at a rate of 21 mm week⁻¹. No effluent was applied during the winter period.

The drainage period of the *E. nitens* was shorter than that of the *S. kinuyanagi*, and rates of leaching were respectively lower. Both these treatments leached for shorter periods than *E. saligna*. Leaching of the bare-soil treatment was consistently high throughout the experiment. Water use through evapotranspiration was found to have a large impact on drainage volume and timing.

The trees were shown to improve effluent treatment because high evapotranspiration rates reduced the volume of leachate passing beyond the root zone. Further, uptake of nitrogen by the trees reduced the quantities of nitrogen available for leaching. In this study both *E. nitens* and *S. kimuyanagi* were more suitable for land treatment than the other 2 treatments evaluated. The low nitrogen concentration in the leachate under the *S. kimuyanagi* is the key criterion which determines the suitability of this tree species for land treatment of effluent. The low total loading of nitrogen to the groundwater of the *E. nitens* treatments is the key criterion in determining *E. nitens* suitability. Although the nitrogen concentrations in the leachate of the tree treatments were generally less than the bare soil treatments, they were still greater than the New Zealand drinking water standard (NZDWS) of 11.3 mg NO₃⁻-N, during certain periods of the experiment. From the lysimeter experiment it was concluded that the leachate nitrogen concentrations might have been reduced if the amount of nitrogen applied in the effluent was reduced.

Total production of above-ground biomass in the 2.5 years, based on the stocking rate of 4000 stems ha⁻¹ was equivalent to 15.6, 30.6, and 21.3 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ for *E. saligna*, *E. nitens*, and *S. kimuyanagi* respectively. Although scaling up biomass estimates from small plot trials and particularly lysimeters introduces associated errors, the estimates fell within the ranges measured elsewhere in New Zealand.

The lysimeter study was complemented by the modelling of the water and nitrogen balances of SRF land treatment systems. Ultimately, the aim of the model was to investigate the effect of changes in management practices on sustainability in terms of nitrogen leaching of SRF systems treating dairy-shed effluent. The model selected for this purpose was a lumped parameter model (LPM). The water and nitrogen balances of

the bare soil and *E. nitens* treatments were simulated with the model to determine the applicability of an LPM scheme to predict system behaviour. The model predicted, with broad agreement, the measured water and nitrogen balances of the lysimeter experiment. The model was then used to simulate the behaviour of a SRF plantation receiving dairy-shed effluent at a rate of $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ over 27 years. This simulation predicted the occurrence of high nitrate concentrations in the leachate. This would be a limiting factor for the long term sustainability of such a system. A sensitivity analysis of the model was used to reveal the important parameters of water movement and nitrogen cycling that effect both nitrogen concentration and quantity in the leachate moving below the root zone. Water movement was most sensitive to root zone depth, effective rainfall, available water and crop water use. The nitrogen fate parameters with greatest effect on leachate nitrogen concentration and quantity were denitrification activity and volatilisation. Plant growth parameters of light utilisation efficiency, maximum leaf nitrogen concentration and specific leaf area strongly effected leachate nitrogen concentration and quantity. Mineralisation rates of the soil humus and the senescence rates of plant material also impacted on quantity and concentration of nitrogen leaching.

The model's applicability as a decision support tool was demonstrated by examining the impact of various effluent loading rates on the leachate concentration and quantity. Based on leachate nitrate concentrations being on average lower than the NZDWS, the key finding was that the sustainable loading rate for the simulated system was found to be around $75 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

The major finding of both the lysimeter experiment and the modelling study was the high nitrogen concentrations leaching from SRF dairy-shed effluent treatment systems. The LPM model clearly provides a platform from which to investigate many other possible scenarios of management to minimise the leaching of the high concentrations of nitrogen into the ground water.

Acknowledgements

I was fortunate to be funded during my PhD by the following sources, Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (CO6618), the C. Alma Baker Trust, the New Zealand Large Herds Association, the MacMillan Brown Agricultural Research Scholarship, the Leonard Condell Farming Scholarship, and Helen E. Akers Scholarship. I would also like to thank HortResearch and Massey University for support.

Thanks to the supervisory group of Nanthi Bolan, Brent Clothier, Steve Green and Ralph Sims for their guidance, support and advice throughout the PhD. I am grateful to Ralph for the initiation of such a challenging project. My thanks are extended to Brent for continued support throughout, particularly in securing funding. Many thanks also to Nanthi for his friendly discussions and continued interest both the research and in my well being. Steve Green's assistance in all aspects of the research, especially with the modelling has been greatly appreciated. Cheers guys.

Thanks to the many people whom assisted in the field work component of this research. Particularly to Gerard Harrigan whom installed and maintained the data logging equipment and to Dexter McGee whom assisted both in the field and lab work. I would also like to thank Ian Furket and Bob Toose for their guidance throughout the long hours of lab work.

I would also like to thank my family and friends for their continued support.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
1.2 OBJECTIVES	4
1.3 PREVIEW OF THE CHAPTERS.....	4
CHAPTER 2 TREE GROWTH AND PRODUCTIVITY.....	6
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	6
2.1.1 Land treatment and biomass production.....	7
2.1.2 Sustainability issues.....	7
2.1.3 Dairy-shed effluent treatment using SRF.....	8
2.1.4 Species selection.....	8
2.1.5 Species performance.....	9
2.1.6 Importance of dry matter production.....	11
2.1.7 Root production.....	12
2.1.8 Above ground biomass production	13
2.2 METHODS	14
2.2.1 Experimental design	14
2.2.2 Above ground biomass production	16
2.2.3 Root production.....	18
2.3 RESULTS.....	20
2.3.1 Leaf area development.....	20
2.3.2 Above ground biomass production	21
2.3.3 Root production.....	22
2.3.4 Biomass allocation	24
2.4 DISCUSSION	26
2.4.1 Leaf area development.....	26
2.4.2 Above ground biomass production	28
2.4.3 Root production.....	29
2.4.4 Biomass allocation	32
2.5 CONCLUSIONS	34
CHAPTER 3 WATER BALANCE.....	35
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	35
3.2 METHODS	38
3.2.1 Experimental design	38
3.2.2 Effluent irrigation.....	38
3.2.3 Rainfall	40
3.2.4 Soil water storage.....	43
3.2.5 Drainage.....	46
3.2.6 Evaporation and Evapotranspiration	46
3.2.7 Data collection frequency.....	49
3.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	50
3.3.1 Effluent irrigation.....	50
3.3.2 Rainfall	50
3.3.3 Water balance	56
3.3.4 Tree water use.....	59
3.3.5 Water stress.....	60
3.3.6 Drainage.....	61
3.3.7 Management strategy.....	62
3.4 CONCLUSIONS	63
CHAPTER 4 NITROGEN BALANCE	65
4.1 INTRODUCTION.....	65
4.2 METHODS	68
4.2.1 Experiment design	68
4.2.2 Effluent source and application.....	69
4.2.3 Soil sampling techniques.....	69

4.2.4	<i>Biomass nitrogen content</i>	70
4.2.5	<i>Nitrogen leaching</i>	71
4.2.6	<i>Determination of nitrogen content</i>	71
4.3	RESULTS	72
4.3.1	<i>Effluent nitrogen loading</i>	72
4.3.2	<i>Soil nitrogen content</i>	73
4.3.3	<i>Biomass nitrogen content</i>	78
4.3.4	<i>Nitrogen leaching</i>	82
4.3.5	<i>Nitrogen balance</i>	88
4.4	DISCUSSION	90
4.4.1	<i>Effluent application</i>	90
4.4.2	<i>Changes in soil nitrogen status</i>	91
4.4.3	<i>Biomass nitrogen content</i>	92
4.4.4	<i>Leachate nitrogen losses</i>	95
4.4.5	<i>Volatilization</i>	100
4.4.6	<i>Denitrification</i>	102
4.5	CONCLUSIONS	104
CHAPTER 5 MODELLING		105
5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	105
5.2	MODEL SELECTION	106
5.3	MODELLING METHODOLOGY	109
5.4	SIMULATION OF THE LYSIMETER EXPERIMENT	112
5.4.1	<i>Introduction</i>	112
5.4.2	<i>Determination of parameters for the LPM model</i>	112
5.4.3	<i>Simulation results and discussion</i>	117
5.5	MODELLING AT THE PLANTATION SCALE	122
5.5.1	<i>Reference scenario description and parameterisation</i>	122
5.5.2	<i>Scenario results and discussion</i>	124
5.6	SENSITIVITY ANALYSIS	133
5.6.1	<i>Soil properties of water movement</i>	134
5.6.2	<i>Crop parameters relating to water movement</i>	136
5.6.3	<i>Nitrogen transformation parameters</i>	139
5.6.4	<i>Crop parameters of growth and nitrogen uptake</i>	141
5.6.5	<i>Parameters of mineralisation and senescence</i>	141
5.6.6	<i>Summary</i>	144
5.7	MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	145
5.8	CONCLUSIONS	155
CHAPTER 6 GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....		157
6.1	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	157
6.2	FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	163
REFERENCES.....		165
APPENDICES		175
APPENDIX A.....		176
	<i>Mathematical description of the model</i>	176
APPENDIX B		183
	<i>Parameter files used for model simulations</i>	183
APPENDIX C		194
	<i>In Press: Copy of paper accepted for publication in the Australian Journal of Soil Research,</i> <i>Volume 37, Issue 5, 1999.</i>	194
ADDENDUM.....		211
NOTES OF CLARIFICATION		211
	<i>General</i>	211
	<i>Specific</i>	212

List of Figures

Chapter 2

- Figure 2.1** An *E. saligna* lysimeter showing the irrigation sprinklers. The lysimeters were 1.0 m deep and 1.8 m in diameter. 15
- Figure 2.2** The four treatments, photographed following the felling and removal of the guard trees. Stumps of the harvested guard trees can be seen in the foreground. Trees age 2.5 years. 17
- Figure 2.3** A root core collected from the soil profile of an *E. saligna* lysimeter..... 19
- Figure 2.4** Mean leaf area of the three tree species as determined by leaf counts from individual trees. Vertical bars represent the standard deviation. 21
- Figure 2.5** Root length density and root mass of fine roots as estimated by soil coring. Means and standard deviations for each treatment are presented. 24
- Figure 2.6** Total mass produced by the trees separated into major tree components expressed as a) dry matter production and b) percentage allocation 25

Chapter 3

- Figure 3.1** Water inputs and outputs of the lysimeter. 38
- Figure 3.2** Lysimeters showing TDR instrumentation and the layers of soil used for calculation of total lysimeter soil water content (see text for details). Probes are labeled by their orientation (V for vertical, H for horizontal) and their depth beneath the soil surface (mm) a) The layout of a weighed lysimeter b) The layout of a static lysimeter. 44
- Figure 3.3** a) Water inputs from rainfall and effluent b) Soil water content data from TDR measurements of an *E. nitens* lysimeter. Probes are labeled by their orientation (V for vertical, H for horizontal) and their depth beneath the soil surface (mm). The total water store (W) for the lysimeter is also shown in relation to the separate probe measurements. 45
- Figure 3.4** Bare-soil monthly water balance a) System inputs - total rainfall and effluent applied. b) System storage - mean values of soil water storage of the 3 bare-soil lysimeters and the standard deviation. c) System outputs - mean values of drainage and evaporation of the 3 bare-soil lysimeters and the standard deviation. The dashed line represents the modelled data for bare-soil evaporation. See text for details. 52
- Figure 3.5** *E. saligna* (evergreen) monthly water balance a) System inputs - total rainfall and effluent applied. b) System storage - mean values of soil water storage of the 2 *E. saligna* lysimeters and the standard deviation. c) System outputs - mean values of drainage and evapotranspiration of the two *E. saligna* lysimeters and the standard deviation. See text for details. 53
- Figure 3.6** *Eucalyptus nitens* (evergreen) monthly water balance a) System inputs - total rainfall and effluent applied. b) System storage- values of soil water storage of the three *E. nitens* lysimeters and the standard deviation. c) System outputs - mean values of drainage and evapotranspiration of the 3 *E. nitens* lysimeters and the standard deviation. See text for details. 54
- Figure 3.7** *S. kinuyanagi* (deciduous) monthly water balance a) System inputs - total rainfall and effluent applied. b) System storage - mean values of soil water storage of the three *S. kinuyanagi* lysimeters and the standard deviation. c) System outputs - mean values of drainage and evapotranspiration of the three *S. kinuyanagi* lysimeters and the standard deviation. See text for details. 55

Chapter 4

Figure 4.1 Inputs and outputs of water and nitrogen measured in the lysimeter treatments.....	68
Figure 4.2 Effluent application to the lysimeters a) Volume of effluent applied given as the mean daily average and barely visable standard deviation b) Nitrogen concentration of the effluent presented as mean monthly average and standard deviation also showing the NZ drinking water standard (NZDWS) c) Nitrogen additions from the effluent shown as mean daily averages and standard devistion	74
Figure 4.3 Total nitrogen content of the soil before and after the experiment. Applied nitrogen was in mineral form.	75
Figure 4.4 The depthwise distribution of total soil nitrogen in the lysimeters at the beginning and end of the experiment. The total amount of effluent nitrogen applied is shown for comparison as an average value for the whole lysimeter.	76
Figure 4.5 Mineral nitrogen stored in the soil before and after the experiment a) NO_3^- -N and b) NH_4^+ -N. Note the different scales for the two graphs.....	77
Figure 4.6 Mineral NO_3^- -N and NH_4^+ -N depthwise distribution at the end of the experiment shown as means and standard deviations. Note the different scales for two graphs. Application of mineral nitrogen is shown as an average value for the whole lysimeter.....	78
Figure 4.7 The nitrogen content of the biomass, by mass in each size group (a) and by the percentage within each biomass category (b). The size group of large stems includes the stump.....	80
Figure 4.8 The bare-soil drainage volume (mean daily average and standard deviation) (a) and the leachate nitrogen concentration (monthly average and standard deviation) (b). Also shown is the New Zealand drinking water standard (NZDWS). In (c) is quantity of nitrogen leached (mean daily average and standard deviation).	84
Figure 4.9 The <i>E. saligna</i> drainage volume (mean daily average and standard deviation) (a) and the leachate nitrogen concentration (monthly average and standard deviation) (b). Also shown is the New Zealand drinking water standard (NZDWS). In (c) is quantity of nitrogen leached (mean daily average and standard deviation).	85
Figure 4.10 The <i>E. nitens</i> drainage volume (mean daily average and standard deviation) (a) and the leachate nitrogen concentration (monthly average and standard deviation) (b). Also shown is the New Zealand drinking water standard (NZDWS). In (c) is quantity of nitrogen leached (mean daily average and standard deviation).	86
Figure 4.11 The <i>S. kinuyanagi</i> drainage volume (mean daily average and standard deviation) (a) and the leachate nitrogen concentration (monthly average and standard deviation) (b). Also shown is the New Zealand drinking water standard (NZDWS). In (c) is quantity of nitrogen leached (mean daily average and standard deviation).	87

Chapter 5

Figure 5.1 Flow chart of the model development for decision support. Lighter coloured boxes indicate the emphasis of this chapter.....	108
Figure 5.2 The lumped parameter model for water flow. Rain or effluent falls on the soil at a rate V_o , and depending on the soil's hydraulic conductivity K , it may either enter or run off. The soil has an average water content $\bar{\theta}$. Drainage is a function of K and $\bar{\theta}$. Plant uptake depends on net radiation R_n , air temperature T_a , and $\bar{\theta}$	110

- Figure 5.3** Schematic of the Lumped Parameter Model of nitrogen dynamics in the soil. Two linked pools of nitrogen are considered, the mineral pool of ammonium and nitrate, and the organic pool. The organic pool is divided into a fast cycling litter pool, and a more stable humus pool..... 111
- Figure 5.4** Bare soil measured and modelled data a) water content of the soil profile, W , also showing the rainfall (R) and irrigation events (I). b) Nitrate concentrations in the leachate. c) Cumulative drainage, (Cum. D) and cumulative nitrogen leached (Cum. L).. 119
- Figure 5.5** *E. nitens* measured and modelled data a) water content of the soil profile, W , also showing the rainfall (R) and irrigation events (I). b) Nitrate concentrations in the leachate. c) Cumulative drainage, (Cum. D) and cumulative nitrogen leached (Cum. L).. 120
- Figure 5.6** Annual water and nitrogen balances of a simulated SRF treatment system receiving dairy shed effluent application of $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ year}^{-1}$ over 27 years a) Annual water inputs of rainfall and effluent irrigation and water outputs through ET. b) Drainage volume and quantity of nitrogen in the leachate. c) Nitrogen inputs from mineralisation and outputs through plant uptake, volatilization and mineralisation. 127
- Figure 5.7** Dry matter production of a simulated SRF crop irrigated dairy-shed effluent. Weekly irrigation in 'summer' applies a total of $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ 128
- Figure 5.8** Leachate concentrations of nitrate and ammonium predicted by the model for the simulation of SRF dairy-shed effluent treatment. Weekly irrigation in 'summer' applies a total of $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ 128
- Figure 5.9** Comparison of daily soil nitrogen concentrations with the mean annual nitrogen concentrations showing drainage events a) year of small change in soil N concentration b) year of large change in soil nitrogen concentration. 132
- Figure 5.10** Sensitivity analysis of the change in mean-annual nitrogen concentrations in the leachate (N_C) to changes in the parameters of soil properties. Reference values are $\theta_s=0.44 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\theta_f=0.39 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\theta_w=0.08 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\beta = 0.0293$, $\rho_b=1.26 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ and $K_s=750 \text{ mm day}^{-1}$ 135
- Figure 5.11** Sensitivity analysis of the change in mean-annual nitrogen loading beyond the rootzone (N_L) to changes in the parameters of soil properties. Reference values are $\theta_s=0.44 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\theta_f=0.39 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\theta_w=0.08 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$, $\beta = 0.0293$, $\rho_b=1.26 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ and $K_s=750 \text{ mm day}^{-1}$ 135
- Figure 5.12** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen concentrations in the leachate (N_C) to changes in crop parameters relating to water movement. Reference values are $R_e=0.9$, $z_R=1.0 \text{ m}$, $k_c=1.0$, $\tau=0.5$, and $E_s=2.5 \text{ mm day}^{-1}$ 138
- Figure 5.13** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen loading beyond the rootzone (N_L) to changes in the crop parameters relating to water movement. Reference values are $R_e=0.9$, $z_R=1.0 \text{ m}$, $k_c=1.0$, $\tau=0.5$, and $E_s=2.5 \text{ mm day}^{-1}$ 138
- Figure 5.14** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen concentrations in the leachate (N_C) to changes in the parameters of nitrogen transformation rates. Reference values are $k_2=0.2 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_3=0.06 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_{DA}=5 \text{ L kg}^{-1}$, $k_v=0.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$ and $\delta_b=0.06 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ 140
- Figure 5.15** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen loading beyond the rootzone (N_L) to changes in the parameters of nitrogen transformation rate. Reference values are $k_2=0.2 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_3=0.06 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_{DA}=5 \text{ L kg}^{-1}$, $k_v=0.5 \text{ day}^{-1}$ and $\delta_b=0.06 \text{ m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}$ 140
- Figure 5.16** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen concentrations in the leachate (N_C) to changes in the parameters of tree growth and uptake. The reference values are $N_f=3\%$, $\varepsilon=1.7 \text{ g DM MJ}^{-1}$ and $\sigma_f=5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ha-leaf kg-DM}^{-1}$ 142
- Figure 5.17** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen loading beyond the rootzone (N_L) to changes in the parameters of tree growth and uptake. The reference values are $N_f=3\%$, $\varepsilon=1.7 \text{ g DM MJ}^{-1}$ and $\sigma_f=5 \times 10^{-4} \text{ ha-leaf kg-DM}^{-1}$ 142

- Figure 5.18** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen concentrations in the leachate (N_C) to changes in the parameters of mineralisation. Reference values are $k_{lit}=0.0080 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_{hum}=7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_R=0.0055 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_S=0.0003 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_L=0.0013 \text{ day}^{-1}$ 143
- Figure 5.19** Sensitivity analysis of the mean-annual nitrogen loading beyond the rootzone (N_L) to changes in the parameters of mineralisation. Reference values are $k_{lit}=0.0080 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $k_{hum}=7 \times 10^{-5} \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_R=0.0055 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_S=0.0003 \text{ day}^{-1}$, $\gamma_L=0.0013 \text{ day}^{-1}$ 143
- Figure 5.20** Model output for SRF receiving effluent application of $2.38 \text{ mm week}^{-1}$ in the summer. Total annual effluent loading is $50 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ a) daily rainfall, $R \text{ (mm)}$ b) weekly irrigation, $I \text{ (mm)}$ and water content of the soil profile, $\theta \text{ (m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}\text{)}$ c) leachate nitrate concentration, $\text{NO}_3^- \text{ conc. (mg L}^{-1}\text{)}$ d) daily drainage of nitrogen from the root zone, $N \text{ leached (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}$ 148
- Figure 5.21** Model output for SRF receiving effluent application of $4.75 \text{ mm week}^{-1}$ in the summer. Total annual effluent loading is $100 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ a) daily rainfall, $R \text{ (mm)}$ b) weekly irrigation, $I \text{ (mm)}$ and water content of the soil profile, $\theta \text{ (m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}\text{)}$ c) leachate nitrate concentration, $\text{NO}_3^- \text{ conc. (mg L}^{-1}\text{)}$ d) daily drainage of nitrogen from the root zone, $N \text{ leached (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}$ 149
- Figure 5.22** Model output for SRF receiving effluent application of 9.5 mm week^{-1} in the summer. Total annual effluent loading is $200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ a) daily rainfall, $R \text{ (mm)}$ b) weekly irrigation, $I \text{ (mm)}$ and water content of the soil profile, $\theta \text{ (m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}\text{)}$ c) leachate nitrate concentration, $\text{NO}_3^- \text{ conc. (mg L}^{-1}\text{)}$ d) daily drainage of nitrogen from the root zone, $N \text{ leached (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}$ 150
- Figure 5.23** Model output for SRF receiving effluent application of 19 mm week^{-1} in the summer. Total annual effluent loading is $400 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$ a) daily rainfall, $R \text{ (mm)}$ b) weekly irrigation, $I \text{ (mm)}$ and water content of the soil profile, $\theta \text{ (m}^3 \text{ m}^{-3}\text{)}$ c) leachate nitrate concentration, $\text{NO}_3^- \text{ conc. (mg L}^{-1}\text{)}$ d) daily drainage of nitrogen from the root zone, $N \text{ leached (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}$ 151
- Figure 5.24** Effect of increasing nitrogen loading rate onto a SRF dairy-shed effluent system on mean-annual leachate nitrogen-concentration (N_C). 153
- Figure 5.25** Effect of increasing nitrogen loading rate onto a SRF dairy-shed effluent system on mean annual nitrogen leaching (N_L). 153

List of Tables

Chapter 2

Table 2.1 Harvest dates of the nine trees in the experiment	17
Table 2.2 Mean dry matter yield (kg tree^{-1}) of above-ground components of three tree species harvested at 2.5 years old.	22
Table 2.3 Root and stump dry matter production (kg tree^{-1}).	23
Table 2.4 Total biomass production of the tree components and the whole tree (kg tree^{-1})	25

Chapter 3

Table 3.1 Seasonal water balance (mm) of the 4 treatments. Except for tree water use, the conversion from volume (L) to depth equivalent (mm) is simply based on the area of the lysimeter. Tree water use is converted from volume (L) to equivalent depth (mm) based on a stocking density of 4000 stems ha^{-1} . Numbers in italics contain some calculated values (see text for details).	51
---	----

Chapter 4

Table 4.1 Nitrogen loading from effluent application for the lysimeters in the separate seasons and for whole experiment.	72
Table 4.2 Tree component nitrogen concentration and uptake.	80
Table 4.3 The seasonal nitrate leaching during the experiment. Expressed as drainage volume, D (mm), leachate concentration, C (mg N L^{-1}) and quantity of nitrogen leached, L (g N). Nitrate leaching was measured for individual events, each with a specific volume and nitrogen concentration. Numbers in italics contain some values of calculated drainage volume (see text for details).	88
Table 4.4 Nitrogen balance of the four treatments. All units are $\text{grams N lysimeter}^{-1}$	89

Chapter 5

Table 5.1 Parameters of the LPM model utilised for the simulation of the bare soil and <i>E. nitens</i> treatments of the lysimeter experiment.	113
Table 5.2 Water and nitrogen balances for 1996 as measured in the experiment and predicted by the LPM model.	118
Table 5.3 Model prediction of the water balance of SRF system treating dairy shed effluent ($200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for 25 years. Bold numbers indicate maximum, minimum, means or standard deviation for the column. All units are mm yr^{-1}	125
Table 5.4 Model prediction of the nitrogen balance of SRF system treating dairy shed effluent ($200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) for 25 years. Bold numbers indicate maximum, minimum, means or standard deviation for the column. Concentrations are expressed as mg N L^{-1} , all other units $\text{kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$	126
TABLE 5.5 Mean annual budgets for water and nitrogen of a SRF system receiving different loading rates of dairy-shed effluent.	147

List of Symbols

Definition	Symbol	Unit
<u>Water balance equations</u>		
Evapotranspiration	ET	mm
Potential Evaporation (Penman monteith)	E_p	mm day ⁻¹
Evaporation	E	mm day ⁻¹
Drainage	D	mm
Irrigation	I	mm
Soil water storage	W	mm
Total rainfall	R_t	mm
Effective rainfall	R_e	mm
Soil water content	θ	m ³ m ⁻³
Constant (Eq 3.11)	c	mm day ⁻¹
Time	t	day ⁻¹
<u>Water movement</u>		
Maximum water content	θ_s	m ³ m ⁻³
Field capacity	θ_f	m ³ m ⁻³
Wilting point	θ_w	m ³ m ⁻³
Saturated hydraulic conductivity	K_s	mm day ⁻¹
Beta constant	β	
Soil bulk density	ρ_b	Mg m ⁻³
Root zone depth	z_R	m
Maximum soil evaporation	E_s	mm day ⁻¹
<u>Nitrogen parameters</u>		
Nitrate adsorption	k_{DN}	L kg ⁻¹
Ammonium adsorption	k_{DA}	L kg ⁻¹
Nitrification	k_2	day ⁻¹
Denitrification	k_3	day ⁻¹
Denitrification zone below θ_f	δ_D	m ³ m ⁻³
Volatilisation (days time evaporation rate)	k_v	days
C:N ratio	r_o	
Critical N content for growth	N_{crit}	kg N ha ⁻¹
Decomposition of litter	k_{lit}	day ⁻¹
Decomposition of humus	k_{hum}	day ⁻¹
<u>Crop parameters</u>		
Crop factor	k_c	
Drought tolerance	τ	
Light utilisation efficiency	ε	g DM MJ ⁻¹
Senescence rate of roots	γ_R	day ⁻¹
Senescence rate of stems	γ_W	day ⁻¹
Senescence rate of leaves	γ_F	day ⁻¹
Maximum leaf N content	N_f	mg N g ⁻¹
Allocation to leaves	A_l	
Allocation to stems	A_s	
Allocation to roots	A_r	
Specific leaf area	σ_f	ha-leaf kg-DM ⁻¹