

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.

**CHARACTERISATION OF HERBICIDE BEHAVIOUR
IN SOME INNOVATIVE GROWING MEDIA**

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

**Doctor of Philosophy
in Soil Science**

at Massey University, Palmerston North

New Zealand.

Trevor Kenneth James

2008

ABSTRACT

An abundance of waste products from the forestry industry (sawdust and paper pulp) lead to the concept of using them as growing media for high value crops on a field scale. However, management of subsequent weed growth posed a problem as the impact of these novel media on the performance and fate of herbicides was unknown. Three aspects of sawdust and paper pulp waste were examined and compared to two cropping soils, viz. their effect on herbicide behaviour with regard to crop selectivity, weed control efficacy and the environmental fate of selected chemicals.

Cropping species such as lettuce and onions were more susceptible to alachlor and chlorpropham in sawdust than in paper pulp. The two cropping soils evaluated (Horotiu sandy loam and Mangateretere silt loam) tended to be intermediate although the former was often close to the sawdust and the latter to the paper pulp in terms of herbicide phytotoxicity to the crop plants. For the less water soluble herbicide pendimethalin, the differences in crop selectivity in the different media were not significant.

The effect of the media on the efficacy of weed control was evaluated through plant species with a much lower tolerance to the herbicides evaluated in contrast to the above species. For these plants the efficacy of the herbicides was generally lower in both the sawdust and paper pulp than in the two soils. The effect was more pronounced with the more soluble alachlor, where efficacy was reduced by factors of 5 – 10, compared to pendimethalin where efficacy reduction was by factors of 0 – 3.

The two high organic media had contrasting effects on the various environmental behaviour indices evaluated. Herbicide adsorption as quantified by distribution coefficient (K_d) was higher in the two novel media compared to both the Horotiu and Mangateretere soils. However, when the K_d was normalised to organic carbon (K_{oc}), there was less variation amongst the media indicating that organic matter is an important factor in controlling sorption in these media. However, despite the high level of adsorption in the sawdust, herbicides were most prone to leaching in this medium. Conversely the paper pulp tended to be more retentive while the two soils were intermediate. The degradation as quantified by half-lives ($t_{1/2}$) of the herbicides was generally slower in the two novel media, probably reflecting the higher sorption in these two media but also due to the lower level of microbial activity in the sawdust and paper pulp.

The study shows that herbicide behaviour in these carbon based media differs significantly from that expected from soil organic matter, mainly due to the non-humified nature of the organic matter in the media and its poor biological activity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful for the assistance and encouragement of many colleagues during this study and wish to sincerely thank the following:

Dr Anis Rahman, Senior Scientist, AgResearch, Ruakura Research Centre, for support and guidance throughout the project and for ensuring that resources and finance were available for this research.

Professor Nanthi S Bolan, Chair of Environmental Science, Centre for Environment Risk Assessment and Remediation (CERAR), University of South Australia, for his guidance and encouragement through much of the experimental phase of this project and supervising me for five years as my Massey University Supervisor.

Dr Kerry C Harrington, Senior Lecturer in Weed Science, Institute of Natural Resources, Massey University, who at a late stage took over the role of lead supervisor and ably guided me through the preparation of this thesis.

Dr Patrick Holland, Senior Scientist, Cawthron Institute, for his excellent technical guidance in the project and for critically reading the manuscript.

Dr John Waller, Biometrician, AgResearch, for guidance and assistance with the statistics, in particular with fitting the Bayesian smoothed curves to the bioassay and degradation data.

Dr Sally Gaw, Scientist, Chemistry Department, University of Canterbury, for helpful suggestions on the final draft of the manuscript.

Mike Trolove, AgResearch, Ruakura Research Centre, for technical assistance with the bioassay studies, the herbicide extractions and the rainfall and leaching studies.

Nancy James, my wife and friend for life, for wonderful support and understanding, particularly in the final stages of thesis writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of contents	iv
List of Tables	ix
List of Figures	xi
List of Plates	xvi
List of Abbreviations	xvii
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	4
1.1 Preservation of our Soil	4
1.2 The “Rich Ditch” Growing System	4
1.3 Herbicide Use	6
1.4 Influence of Waste on Herbicide Behaviour	7
1.5 Aims of this Research	8
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	12
2.1 Use of High Organic Matter Waste Materials in Agriculture	12
2.2 Processes Affecting Herbicide Behaviour in Soil	13
2.2.1 Herbicide Adsorption	13
2.2.2 Herbicide Desorption	15
2.2.3 Herbicide Bioavailability	16
2.2.4 Herbicide Degradation and Persistence	17
2.2.5 Herbicide Transport	18
2.2.6 Modelling herbicide transport	19
2.2.7 Modelling herbicide transport Under New Zealand Conditions	20
2.3 Soil Organic Carbon and Pesticide Fate	24
2.3.1 Dissolved Organic Carbon	24
2.3.2 Endogenous DOC – Sorption and Transport	24
2.3.3 Endogenous DOC – Degradation	25
2.3.4 Exogenous DOC – Sorption and Transport	26
2.3.5 Exogenous DOC – Degradation	27
2.4 Herbicides Used in this Study	27
2.4.1 Selected Herbicide Properties	27
2.5 Summary of Literature Review	31

CHAPTER 3: BIOAVAILABILITY AND PLANT UPTAKE	34
3.1 Objective	34
3.2 Introduction	34
3.3 Materials and Methods	36
3.3.1 Media Preparation	36
3.3.2 Herbicides	37
3.3.3 Laying Down of Pot Experiments	38
3.4 Results	42
3.4.1 Overview	42
3.4.2 Herbicide/Tolerant Species Interactions in Four Growing Media	42
3.4.2.1 Alachlor on Onions	42
3.4.2.2 Alachlor on Broccoli	44
3.4.2.3 Chlorpropham on Onions	46
3.4.2.4 Chlorpropham on Lettuce	48
3.4.2.5 Pendimethalin on Onions	49
3.4.2.6 Effect of Organic Carbon on Bioavailability for the Tolerant Species	51
3.4.3 Dose-response Curves for Sensitive Species in Four Growing Media	51
3.4.3.1 Foxtail Millet with Alachlor	51
3.4.3.2 Annual Ryegrass with Alachlor	53
3.4.3.3 Annual Ryegrass with Chlorpropham	54
3.4.3.4 Garden Cress with Chlorpropham	56
3.4.3.5 Garden Cress with Pendimethalin	57
3.4.3.6 Oats and Sorghum with Pendimethalin	59
3.4.4 Parameters of the Dose-response Curves	61
3.5 Discussion	67
3.5.1 Herbicide-Tolerant Species Interactions in Four Growing Media	67
3.5.2 Dose-Response Curves for Sensitive Species in Four Growing Media ...	68
3.5.3 Bioavailability	69
3.6 Conclusions	71
 CHAPTER 4: ADSORPTION	 74
4.1 Objective	74
4.2 Introduction	74
4.3 Materials and Methods	76
4.3.1 Batch Equilibrium Method	76
4.3.2 Determination of Herbicide Fortification	76

4.3.3	Determination of Herbicide in Extracted Soil Solution	76
4.3.4	Determination of Total Herbicide in the Media	77
4.3.5	Quantification by High Performance Liquid Chromatography (HPLC)	78
4.3.6	Quantification of Alachlor by Gas Chromatography (GC)	78
4.4	Results	80
4.4.1	Determination of Herbicide Concentrations	80
4.4.2	Calculation of Distribution Coefficients	81
4.5	Discussion	85
4.6	Conclusions	90
CHAPTER 5: PERSISTENCE AND DEGRADATION		94
5.1	Objective	94
5.2	Introduction	94
5.3	Materials and Methods	95
5.3.1	Media Preparation	95
5.3.2	Determination of Maximum Water Holding Capacity (MWHC)	95
5.3.3	Determination of Media pH	96
5.3.4	Degradation Studies	96
5.3.5	Herbicide Extraction	97
5.3.5.1	Procedure for Atrazine Extraction from Media	97
5.3.5.2	Procedure for Bromacil Extraction from Media	98
5.3.5.3	Treatment of the Control Fortification Samples	98
5.3.5.4	Quantification by HPLC	98
5.4	Results	99
5.4.1	Herbicide Fortification Control Samples	99
5.4.2	Herbicide Extraction	99
5.4.3	Degradation Profiles	106
5.4.3.1	Degradation of Atrazine in Four Media under Five Different Regimes.....	106
5.4.3.2	Degradation of Bromacil in Four Media under Five Different Regimes.....	113
5.5	Discussion	120
5.5.1	Hypothesis Testing	120
5.5.2	Degradation of Atrazine and Bromacil	120
5.5.3	Microbial Degradation	122
5.5.4	Degradation Half-life	123
5.5.5	Models for Enhanced Degradation	125
5.5.6	Descriptors for Enhanced Degradation	130

5.5.7	Causes of Enhanced Degradation	131
5.6	Conclusions	132
CHAPTER 6: MOBILITY AND LEACHING		136
6.1	Objective	136
6.2	Introduction	136
6.3	Materials and Methods	138
6.3.1	Column Bioassay Studies	138
6.3.2	Rainfall Studies	140
6.3.2.1	Rainfall Simulator	140
6.3.2.2	Lysimeter	142
6.3.2.3	Leaching Experiments	143
6.4	Results	144
6.4.1	Bioassay Studies	144
6.4.2	Lysimeter Studies	154
6.4.2.1	Overview	154
6.4.2.2	Leaching of Atrazine in Four Media	156
6.4.2.3	Leaching of Bromacil in Four Media	160
6.4.2.4	Leaching of Atrazine and Bromacil through Horotiu Soil Overlaid with either Paper Pulp or Sawdust	163
6.4.2.5	Properties of the Leachate Collected from the Leaching Experiments	166
6.5	Discussion	176
6.5.1	Column Bioassay Studies	176
6.5.2	Rainfall Studies	179
6.5.3	Influence of Media Leachate Properties in the Transport of Atrazine and Bromacil	181
6.6	Conclusions	184
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUDING DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS OF RESULTS		188
7.1	Reason for this research	188
7.2	Summary of Conclusions	189
7.2.1	Chapter 3: Bioavailability and Plant Uptake	189
7.2.2	Chapter 4: Adsorption	189
7.2.3	Chapter 5: Persistence and Degradation	189
7.2.4	Chapter 6: Mobility and Leaching	190
7.2.5	Overall	190

7.3	Implications of these Findings	191
7.3.1	Crop Susceptibility to Herbicide Phytotoxicity	191
7.3.2	Efficacy of Weed Control Programmes	192
7.3.3	Improved parameter estimation	197
7.3.4	Environmental Fate Modelling and the Present Experiments	198
7.3.5	Enhanced degradation of herbicides	199
7.4	Areas of Future Study	200
	REFERENCES	204

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1:	Chemical family, mode of action, water solubility, soil sorption, half-life in soil and dissociation constant for the five herbicides used in these studies.	28
Table 3.1:	Some physico-chemical properties of the four growing media.	37
Table 3.2:	Summary of some of the registered uses for the three test herbicides in New Zealand.	38
Table 3.3:	List of treatments and the crop species they were used on for Experiments 1 and 2.	40
Table 3.4:	List of treatments used on the sensitive species bioassays Experiments 3 and 4.	40
Table 3.5:	Summary of some important dates for Experiments 1 - 4.	41
Table 3.6:	Average daily maximum temperature and total solar radiation for the growth period (Table 3.5) of species used in Experiments 1 - 4.	41
Table 3.7:	Mean dry matter production and standard error for the crop species grown in Experiments 1 and 2.	44
Table 3.8:	NOEL (ED ₉₀) values for all combinations of herbicides, sensitive bioassay species, and growing media for Experiments 3 - 4.	65
Table 3.9:	ED ₅₀ values for all combinations of herbicides, sensitive bioassay species, and growing media for Experiments 3 - 4.	66
Table 4.1:	Registered use rates for the five herbicides in various crops in New Zealand.	75
Table 4.2:	Parameters for individual herbicides quantified by HPLC.	78
Table 4.3:	Comparison of theoretical and actual fortification.	80
Table 4.4:	Percent recovery of five herbicides from four media.	81
Table 4.5:	Distribution coefficients (K _d) and standard error for five herbicides in four media.	81
Table 4.6:	Soil organic carbon affinity coefficients (K _{oc}) for five herbicides in four media.	82
Table 4.7:	Slope, standard error of the slope (SE) and R ² value for fitted linear regressions of distribution coefficients (K _d) and organic carbon content of the four media.	84
Table 4.8:	Theoretical distribution coefficients (K _d) calculated from a "best estimate" single value K _{oc}	86
Table 4.9	Slope, standard error of the slope (SE) and R ² value for fitted linear regressions of experimental and calculated distribution coefficients (K _d) in the four media (Figs 4.3 – 4.5)	88
Table 5.1:	Maximum water holding capacity values for the four media.	95
Table 5.2:	pH values and the standard error of the mean (SEM) for the four media measured prior to commencement of the degradation experiments and compared to that determined in the commercial laboratories.	96

Table 5.3:	Fortification of herbicide added to each flask for the degradation studies.	99
Table 5.4:	Recovery of atrazine and bromacil from the eight Day-0 samples compared to the original fortification.	101
Table 5.5:	Degradation half-life ($t_{1/2}$ (d) \pm SE, assuming 1 st order kinetics) and R ² linear regression statistic for degradation of atrazine and bromacil in four media under five different degradation regimes.	119
Table 5.6:	Determination of dissipation time (DT ₅₀) for atrazine in the Horotiu soil at three temperatures using two curve fitting methods.	130
Table 6.1:	Quantity of water added to the top of column for the bioassay leaching experiments and the theoretical total water content of the media in the columns on completion.	140
Table 6.2:	Distance leached, for atrazine and bromacil, through packed columns and determined by bioassay.	152
Table 6.3:	Concentration of atrazine and bromacil in the breakthrough leachate (\approx 100 mL) of the two column leaching experiments.	153
Table 6.4:	Properties of the breakthrough leachate (\approx 100 mL) compared to the water used in the column Experiment 2.	153
Table 6.5:	Measured rainfall output from the rainfall generator, calculated rainfall (water) intercepted by the target and quantity of the leachate collected for all three lysimeter experiments.	155
Table 6.6:	Time taken (min) to collect the first four sequential litres of leachate and total leachate collected from the lysimeter leaching Experiments 3, 4 and 5.	156
Table 6.7:	Quantity of atrazine recovered from media and leachate on completion of the lysimeter leaching experiments, as a function of the amount applied (mass balance).	159
Table 6.8:	Quantity of bromacil recovered from media and leachate on completion of the lysimeter leaching experiments, as a function of the amount applied (mass balance).	162
Table 6.9:	Quantity of herbicide recovered from media and leachate on completion of the lysimeter leaching Experiment 5, as a function of the amount applied (mass balance).	166
Table 6.10:	Properties of the first five 1-litre aliquots of leachate from samples of the four media for Experiment 5.	167
Table 6.11:	Nature of relationship (+ve or -ve) and correlation coefficients (R ²) for herbicide concentration and leachate properties for Experiment 5.	175
Table 7.1:	Relationship between ED ₅₀ values (Table 3.7) and the distribution coefficients (K _d , Table 4.5) for combinations of herbicides, bioassay species, and growing media.	193
Table 7.2:	Distribution coefficients (K _d) for five herbicides in four media normalised for bulk density of the medium (K _{dd}).	194
Table 7.3:	Relationship between ED ₅₀ values (Table 3.7) and the distribution coefficients normalised for bulk density (K _{dd} , Table 7.1) for combinations of herbicides, bioassay species, and growing media. ...	195

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 1.1:	Diagram of the Crop & Food Research 'Rich Ditch' growing system (source, Crop & Food Research).	5
Fig. 1.2	Concept diagram of the soil/herbicide interactions that could be influenced by the introduced material of the Rich Ditch system.	8
Fig. 2.1:	Structure and chemical names for alachlor.	28
Fig. 2.2:	Structure and chemical names for atrazine.	29
Fig. 2.3:	Structure and chemical names for bromacil.	29
Fig. 2.4:	Structure and chemical names for chlorpropham.	29
Fig. 2.5:	Structure and chemical names for pendimethalin.	30
Fig. 3.1:	Effect of different rates of alachlor on onions in four growing media in Experiment 1.	43
Fig. 3.2:	Effect of different rates of alachlor on onions in four growing media in Experiment 2.	43
Fig. 3.3:	Effect of different rates of alachlor on broccoli in four growing media in Experiment 1.	45
Fig. 3.4:	Effect of different rates of alachlor on broccoli in four growing media in Experiment 2.	45
Fig. 3.5:	Effect of different rates of chlorpropham on onions in four growing media in Experiment 1.	47
Fig. 3.6:	Effect of different rates of chlorpropham on onions in four growing media in Experiment 2.	47
Fig. 3.7:	Effect of different rates of chlorpropham on lettuce in four growing media in Experiment 1.	48
Fig. 3.8:	Effect of different rates of chlorpropham on lettuce in four growing media in Experiment 2.	49
Fig. 3.9:	Effect of different rates of pendimethalin on onions in four growing media in Experiment 1.	50
Fig. 3.10:	Effect of different rates of pendimethalin on onions in four growing media in Experiment 2.	50
Fig. 3.11:	Comparison of dose-response curves for foxtail millet and alachlor in Experiment 3.	52
Fig. 3.12:	Comparison of dose-response curves for foxtail millet and alachlor in Experiment 4.	52
Fig. 3.13:	Comparison of dose-response curves for annual ryegrass and alachlor in Experiment 3.	54
Fig. 3.14:	Comparison of dose-response curves for annual ryegrass and alachlor in Experiment 4.	53
Fig. 3.15:	Comparison of dose-response curves for annual ryegrass and chlorpropham in Experiment 3.	55
Fig. 3.16:	Comparison of dose-response curves for annual ryegrass and chlorpropham in Experiment 4.	55

Fig. 3.17:	Comparison of dose-response curves for garden cress and chlorpropham in Experiment 3.	56
Fig. 3.18:	Comparison of dose-response curves for garden cress and chlorpropham in Experiment 4.	56
Fig. 3.19:	Comparison of dose-response curves for garden cress and pendimethalin in Experiment 3.	58
Fig. 3.20:	Comparison of dose-response curves for garden cress and pendimethalin in Experiment 4.	58
Fig. 3.21:	Comparison of dose-response curves for oats and pendimethalin in Experiment 3.	59
Fig. 3.22:	Comparison of dose-response curves for sorghum and pendimethalin in Experiment 4.	60
Fig. 3.23:	Logistic model of a dose response curve and the determination of the ED ₅₀ value.	61
Fig. 3.24:	Foxtail millet with alachlor in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	62
Fig. 3.25:	Annual ryegrass with alachlor in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	62
Fig. 3.26:	Annual ryegrass with chlorpropham in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	63
Fig. 3.27:	Garden cress with chlorpropham in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	63
Fig. 3.28:	Garden cress with pendimethalin in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	64
Fig. 3.29:	Sorghum with pendimethalin in four media, fitted dose-response curves with 95% confidence limits and graphic representation of NOEL and ED ₅₀ values: A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	64
Fig. 4.1:	The relationship between the distribution coefficients (K_d) of alachlor, atrazine and bromacil and the organic carbon content of the four media.	83
Fig. 4.2:	The relationship between the distribution coefficients (K_d) of chlorpropham and pendimethalin and the organic carbon content of the four media.	84
Fig. 4.3:	The relationship between the experimentally determined distribution coefficients and those calculated from the 'Best Estimate' K_{oc} of Wauchope et al. (1992) for alachlor, atrazine and bromacil in the four media.	86

Fig. 4.4	The relationship between the experimentally determined distribution coefficients and those calculated from the 'Best Estimate' K_{oc} of Wauchope et al. (1992) for chlorpropham in the four media.	87
Fig 4.5	The relationship between the experimentally determined distribution coefficients and those calculated from the 'Best Estimate' K_{oc} of Wauchope et al. (1992) for pendimethalin in the four media.	87
Fig. 5.1:	HPLC chromatograms for atrazine (0.35 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from Horotiu soil with methanol and SPE cleanup.	102
Fig. 5.2:	HPLC chromatograms for atrazine (13.3 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from Mangateretere soil with methanol and SPE cleanup.	102
Fig. 5.3:	HPLC chromatograms for atrazine (8.2 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from paper pulp with methanol and SPE cleanup.	103
Fig. 5.4:	HPLC chromatograms for atrazine (3.5 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from sawdust with methanol and SPE cleanup showing the large initial peak from the coloured, soluble matter co-extracted.	103
Fig. 5.5:	HPLC chromatograms for bromacil (11.0 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from Horotiu soil with NaOH soln and DCM partitioning.	104
Fig. 5.6:	HPLC chromatograms for bromacil (12.8 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from Mangateretere soil with NaOH soln and DCM partitioning.	104
Fig. 5.7:	HPLC chromatograms for bromacil (13.7 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from paper pulp with NaOH soln and DCM partitioning.	105
Fig. 5.8:	HPLC chromatograms for bromacil (44.6 $\mu\text{g/g}$) extracted from sawdust with NaOH soln and DCM partitioning.	105
Fig. 5.9:	Atrazine degradation at 10°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	108
Fig. 5.10:	Atrazine degradation at 20°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	109
Fig. 5.11:	Atrazine degradation at 30°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	110
Fig. 5.12:	Atrazine degradation at 20±5°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	111
Fig. 5.13:	Atrazine degradation at 20°C sterilised with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	112
Fig. 5.14:	Bromacil degradation at 10°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	114
Fig. 5.15:	Bromacil degradation at 20°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	115
Fig. 5.16:	Bromacil degradation at 30°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	116
Fig. 5.17:	Bromacil degradation at 20±5°C with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	117
Fig. 5.18:	Bromacil degradation at 20°C sterilised with linear scale axes (a), lower plot with semi-log axis (b). Data points are average of duplicate samples.	118

Fig. 5.19: Atrazine degradation at 10°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted logistic curve.	127
Fig. 5.20: Atrazine degradation at 20°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted logistic curve.	127
Fig. 5.21: Atrazine degradation at 30°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted logistic curve.	128
Fig. 5.22: Linearisation of the fitted logistic curves for degradation of atrazine degradation at 10, 20 and 30°C in Horotiu soil.	128
Fig. 5.23: Atrazine degradation at 10°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted Bayesian smoothed curve with 95% confidence intervals (grey hatched area). .	128
Fig. 5.24: Atrazine degradation at 20°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted Bayesian smoothed curve with 95% confidence intervals (grey hatched area). .	129
Fig. 5.25: Atrazine degradation at 30°C in Horotiu soil and a fitted Bayesian smoothed curve with 95% confidence intervals (grey hatched area). .	130
Fig. 6.1: Rainfall intensities (error bars \pm SEM) as determined by the variable controller for the peristaltic pump. $R^2 = 0.988$	141
Fig. 6.2: Distribution of generated raindrop sizes (mm) at intensity of 26 mm/h (pump setting 3) compared to a sample of natural raindrops collected during a light rainfall event.	142
Fig. 6.3: Dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns to detect movement of atrazine with detection limit of 90% of untreated, Experiment 1. Error bars \pm 1 SEM.	148
Fig. 6.4: Dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns to detect movement of atrazine with detection limit of 90% of untreated, Experiment 2. Error bars \pm 1 SEM.	148
Fig. 6.5: Dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns to detect movement of bromacil with detection limit of 90% of untreated, Experiment 1. Error bars \pm 1 SEM.	149
Fig. 6.6: Dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns to detect movement of bromacil with detection limit of 90% of untreated, Experiment 2. Error bars \pm 1 SEM.	149
Fig. 6.7: Movement of atrazine in Experiment 1, Flexicurves of dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns with detection limit of 90% of untreated (broken line) and 95% confidence interval (hatched area): A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	150
Fig. 6.8: Movement of atrazine in Experiment 2, Flexicurves of dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns with detection limit of 90% of untreated (broken line) and 95% confidence interval (hatched area): A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	150
Fig. 6.9: Movement of bromacil in Experiment 1, Flexicurves of dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns with detection limit of 90% of untreated (broken line) and 95% confidence interval (hatched area): A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	151

Fig. 6.10:	Movement of bromacil in Experiment 2, Flexicurves of dry matter of oats grown in leaching columns with detection limit of 90% of untreated (broken line) and 95% confidence interval (hatched area): A paper pulp, B sawdust, C Horotiu silt loam and D Mangateretere silt loam.	151
Fig. 6.11:	Atrazine concentration in each sequential litre of leachate collected. .	157
Fig. 6.12:	Quantity of atrazine in each of the sequential 1-cm layers of media on completion of the leaching experiments.	158
Fig. 6.13:	Bromacil concentration in each sequential litre of leachate collected.	161
Fig. 6.14:	Quantity of bromacil in each of the sequential 1-cm layers of media on completion of the leaching experiments.	162
Fig. 6.15:	Herbicide concentration in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil overlaid with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust after herbicide application to the surface of the media.	164
Fig. 6.16:	Quantity of herbicide in each of the sequential 1-cm layers of media on completion of the leaching experiment.	165
Fig. 6.17:	Atrazine concentration and DOC in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	168
Fig. 6.18:	Atrazine concentration and TDS in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	169
Fig. 6.19:	Atrazine concentration and turbidity in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	170
Fig. 6.20:	Atrazine concentration and pH in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	171
Fig. 6.21:	Bromacil concentration and DOC in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	172
Fig. 6.22:	Bromacil concentration and TDS in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	173
Fig. 6.23:	Bromacil concentration and turbidity in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	174
Fig. 6.24:	Bromacil concentration and pH in each sequential litre of leachate collected from a profile comprising 10 cm of Horotiu soil topped with 5 cm of either paper pulp or sawdust.	175

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1.1:	Onions being grown using the Rich Ditch growing system; A, newly formed beds showing furrows filled with sawdust, B, onions growing in sawdust, C, sawdust beds in foreground with paper pulp beds immediately behind, D, onion crop approaching maturity.	6
Plate 3.1:	Effect of different rates of alachlor on broccoli (from L→R, untreated, 500, 1000, 2000 and 4000 g a.i./ha) in four growing media (A – Horotiu, B – Mangateretere, C – paper pulp, D – sawdust).	46
Plate 3.2:	Effect of different rates of chlorpropham on lettuce (from L→R, untreated, 200, 400, 800 and 1600 g a.i./ha) in four growing media (A – Horotiu, B – Mangateretere, C – paper pulp, D – sawdust)..	49
Plate 6.1:	Examples of the leaching columns containing the four media and illustrating water moving down the column (arrows). Left → Right; paper pulp, sawdust, Horotiu soil, Mangateretere soil. .	139
Plate 6.2:	The rainfall generator mounted 6 m above the floor.	141
Plate 6.3:	The lysimeter showing drainage holes in the base and in operation with sawdust and paper pulp.	143
Plate 6.4:	Bioassay of leaching columns to detect movement of atrazine using oats, Experiment 1.	146
Plate 6.5:	Bioassay of leaching columns to detect movement of bromacil using oats, Experiment 1.	146
Plate 6.6:	Bioassay of leaching columns to detect movement of atrazine using oats, Experiment 2.	147
Plate 6.7:	Bioassay of leaching columns to detect movement of bromacil using oats, Experiment 2.	147
Plate 6.8:	The soil surface on completion of the rainfall Experiment 4 showing the Horotiu soil (left) which was still permeable and the Mangateretere soil (right) which was now largely impervious to water.	155

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

a.i.	Active ingredient
ANOVA	Analysis Of Variance
CAS	A division of the American Chemical Society
DO	Dissolved Oxygen
DOC	Dissolved Organic Carbon (see also OC)
DOM	Dissolved Organic Matter
DT ₅₀	Time required for dissipation of the first 50% of the original pesticide concentration
EC	Emulsifiable Concentrate
ED ₁₀ (ED ₅₀ ; ED ₉₀)	Effective Dose to reduce plant production to 10% (50%; 90%) of untreated
GC	Gas Chromatography
HPLC	High Performance Liquid Chromatography
IUPAC	International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry
K _d	Distribution (partition) coefficient (the ratio of pesticide adsorbed to that in solution)
K _{oc}	Soil organic carbon affinity coefficient (i.e. K _d normalised to OC content)
LD ₅₀ (LD ₉₀)	Lethal Dose required to kill 50% (90%) of the population
LOD	Limit Of Detection
LSD _{0.05}	Least Significant Difference with 95% confidence interval
MWHC	Maximum Water Holding Capacity
NOEL	No Observable Effect Level
NTU	Nephelometric Turbidity Unit
OC	Organic Carbon (often calculated from OM by dividing by 1.73)
ODTMA	Octadecyltrimethylammonium chloride (a surfactant)
OM	Organic Matter
PTFE	Polytetrafluoroethylene or Teflon®
pKa	Acid dissociation constant
rpm	Revolutions per minute
SD	Standard Deviation
SED	Standard Error of Difference
SEM	Standard Error of the Mean
SOM	Soluble Organic Matter
SPE	Solid Phase Extraction
t _½	First-order kinetic half-life
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
WSSOM	Water Soluble Soil Organic Matter