

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.

**A STUDY OF THE QUALITY OF ARTIFICIAL DRAINAGE
UNDER INTENSIVE DAIRY FARMING AND THE
IMPROVED MANAGEMENT OF FARM DAIRY
EFFLUENT USING 'DEFERRED IRRIGATION'.**

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

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD)

in
Soil Science



Institute of Natural Resources
Massey University
Palmerston North, New Zealand

David John Houlbrooke
2005

ABSTRACT

The last decade has been a period of great expansion and land use intensification for the New Zealand dairy farming industry with a 44% increase in national dairy cow numbers. Intensive dairy farming is now considered to be a major contributor to the deterioration in the quality of surface and ground water resources in some regions of New Zealand. Previous research has demonstrated intensive dairy farming is responsible for accelerated contamination of waterways by nutrients, suspended solids, pathogenic organisms and faecal material. A number of common dairy farming practices increase the risk of nutrient leaching. In particular, farm dairy effluent (FDE) has been implicated as a major contributor to the degradation of water quality. With the introduction of the Resource Management Act in 1991, the preferred treatment for FDE shifted away from traditional two-pond systems to land application. However, on most farms, irrigation of FDE has occurred on a daily basis, often without regard for soil moisture status. Therefore, it has been commonplace for partially treated effluent to drain through and/or runoff soils and contaminate fresh water bodies.

The objectives of this thesis were to design and implement a sustainable land application system for FDE on difficult to manage, mole and pipe drained soils, and to assess the impacts of FDE application, urea application and cattle grazing events on nutrient losses via artificial drainage and surface runoff from dairy cattle grazed pasture. To meet these objectives a research field site was established on Massey University's No.4 Dairy farm near Palmerston North. The soil type was Tokomaru silt loam, a Fragiaqualf with poor natural drainage. Eight experimental plots (each 40 x 40 m) were established with two treatments. Four of the plots represented standard farm practice including grazing and fertiliser regimes. Another four plots were subjected to the same farm practices but without the fertiliser application and they were also irrigated with FDE. Each plot had an isolated mole and pipe drainage system. Four surface runoff plots (each 5 m x 10 m) were established as subplots (two on the fertilised plots and two on the plots irrigated with FDE) in the final year of the study. Plots were instrumented to allow the continuous monitoring of drainage and surface runoff and the collection of water samples for nutrient analyses.

An application of 25 mm of FDE to a soil with limited soil water deficit - simulating a 'daily' irrigation regime - resulted in considerable drainage of partially treated FDE. Approximately 70% of the applied FDE left the experimental plots with 10 mm of

drainage and 8 mm of surface runoff. The resulting concentrations of N and P in drainage and runoff were approximately 45% and 80% of the original concentrations in the applied FDE, respectively. From this single irrigation event, a total of 12.1 kg N ha⁻¹ and 1.9 kg P ha⁻¹ was lost to surface water representing 45% of expected annual N loss and 100% of expected annual P loss.

An improved system for applying farm dairy effluent to land called 'deferred irrigation' was successfully developed and implemented at the research site. Deferred irrigation involves the storage of effluent in a two-pond system during periods of small soil moisture deficits and the scheduling of irrigation at times of suitable soil water deficits. Deferred irrigation of FDE all but eliminated direct drainage losses with on average <1% of the volume of effluent and nutrients applied leaving the experimental plots. Adopting an approach of applying 'little and often' resulted in no drainage and, therefore, zero direct loss of nutrients applied.

A modelling exercise, using the APSIM simulation model, was conducted to study the feasibility of practising deferred irrigation at the farm scale on No 4 Dairy farm. Using climate data for the past 30 years, this simulation exercise demonstrated that applying small application depths of FDE, such as 15 mm or less, provided the ability to schedule irrigations earlier in spring and decreased the required effluent storage capacity.

A travelling irrigator, commonly used to apply FDE (a rotating irrigator), was found to have 2-3 fold differences in application depth and increased the risk of generating FDE contaminated drainage. New irrigator technology (an oscillating travelling irrigator) provided a more uniform application pattern allowing greater confidence that an irrigation depth less than the soil water deficit could be applied. This allowed a greater volume to be irrigated, whilst avoiding direct drainage of FDE when the soil moisture deficit is low in early spring and late autumn. A recommendation arising from this work is that during this period of low soil water deficits, all irrigators should be set to travel at their fastest speed (lowest application depth) to minimise the potential for direct drainage of partially treated FDE and associated nutrient losses.

The average concentrations of N and P in both 2002 and 2003 winter mole and pipe drainage water from grazed dairy pastures were all well above the levels required to prevent aquatic weed growth in fresh water bodies. Total N losses from plots representing standard farm practice were 28 kg N ha⁻¹ and 34 kg N ha⁻¹ for 2003 and

2004, respectively. Total P losses in 2003 and 2004 were 0.35 kg P ha⁻¹ and 0.7 kg P ha⁻¹, respectively. Surface runoff was measured in 2003 and contributed a further 3.0 kg N ha⁻¹ and 0.6 kg P ha⁻¹.

A number of common dairy farm practices immediately increased the losses of N and P in the artificial drainage water. Recent grazing events increased NO₃⁻-N and DIP concentrations in drainage by approximately 5 mg litre⁻¹ and 0.1 mg litre⁻¹, respectively. The duration between the grazing and drainage events influenced the form of N loss due to a likely urine contribution when grazing and drainage coincide, but had little impact on the total quantity of N lost. Nitrogen loss from an early spring application of urea in 2002 was minimal, whilst a mid June application in 2003 resulted in an increased loss of NO₃⁻-N throughout 80 mm of cumulative drainage suggesting that careful timing of urea applications in winter is required to prevent unnecessary N leaching.

Storage and deferred irrigation of FDE during the lactation season caused no real increase in either the total-N concentrations or total N losses in the winter drainage water of 2002 and 2003. In contrast, land application of FDE using the deferred irrigation system resulted in a gradual increase in total P losses over the 2002 and 2003 winter drainage seasons. However, this increase represents less than 4% of the P applied in FDE during the lactation season.

An assessment of likely losses of nutrients at a whole-farm scale suggests that it is standard dairy farming practice (particularly intensive cattle grazing) that is responsible for the great majority of N and P loss at a farm scale. When expressed as a proportion of whole-farm losses, only a very small quantity of N is lost under an improved land treatment technique for FDE such as deferred irrigation. The management of FDE plays a greater role in the likely P loss at a farm scale with a 5% contribution to whole-farm P losses from deferred irrigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my four supervisors who have played a major role in this research. Most importantly thanks to my principle supervisor Dr Dave Home for the considerable contribution he had made to my PhD research. In particular his continual support, encouragement, approachability and affability were much appreciated as was his technical advice and guidance and time spent reviewing all aspects of my work. Many thanks to my Co-supervisor Dr Mike Hedley for his continued enthusiasm for my research project, much appreciated technical advice and for his critical reviews of draft papers and chapters. Thanks to my Co-supervisor Dr Dave Scotter for his manuscript editing, advice on all matters related to soil water balance and soil physics and for providing weekly simulation of the soil water balance for my research site. Thank you to external co-supervisor Dr Val Snow (currently AgResearch and formally HortResearch) for her major contribution to the modelling aspect of my PhD research, for being patient with me as I felt my way into the world of soil-water simulations and for providing constructive feedback on draft manuscripts.

I would like to thank James Hanly for his efforts in many aspects of the field related research; in particular the instrumentation and maintenance of the field site and for helping me share the load of collecting drainage samples during the undesirable weekends and early hours of the morning when it was inevitably raining. James provided willing advice to all matters of the research, helped with data manipulation and along with my supervisors co-authored all arising publications.

I gratefully acknowledge the C.Alma Baker Trust for providing me with a doctoral scholarship for the duration of my time at Massey University. I would like to thank Dairy InSight for providing the necessary funding to run my research project and also thank Marley NZ Ltd and Horizons Regional Council for the financial assistance they supplied to the research. Spitfire Irrigators Ltd is thanked for providing an irrigator for field work. I would like to thank the LEM Group of AgResearch for allowing me the time and resources to complete the write up of my thesis whilst undertaking employment within their group at the Invermay Agriculture Centre, Mosgiel.

Agricultural services and in particular all staff of the No. 4 Dairy Farm are thanked for providing the field research site and appropriate resources enable the successful collection of relevant paddock scale drainage collection and effluent research. I would like to thank all other staff from the Institute of Natural Resources that provided help and advice throughout the duration of my research. In particular I would like to thank

the technical team of Bob Toes, Ian Furkert, Ross Wallace, Mike Bretherton, Glenys Wallace and Anne West and past and present group secretaries Hera Kennedy and Moira Hubbard. Thanks to all of my fellow soil science post graduate colleagues for providing help, advice and friendship through out the duration of my PhD research.

I am very grateful to all members of my family – Murray, Cathy, Lisa and Bevan for providing both encouragement and an interest in both the highs and lows of my PhD research and especially for their love and support over the years. Thanks also to my parents in law Heather and Allan for their interest and support of my PhD research.

A huge thank you to my wife Clare for supporting me in my time out of employment to complete further study and for all of the moral support and technical advice she provided throughout its duration. I am fortunate to be married to a fellow environmental scientist who understands my research discipline and reasons for extending it to doctorate level. Clare encouraged me to fulfil my ambition to do a PhD in soil science without which I would not have had the confidence to embark on. Finally I would like to dedicate this thesis to the future health and happiness of our twin daughters Emma and Jessica who were born shortly before its submission (10/05/05).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	I
Abstract	III
Acknowledgements	VI
Table of contents	VIII
List of Figures	XIII
List of tables	XVII
List of plates	XX
1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Reasons for the study	01
1.2 Research objectives	03
1.3 Thesis structure	03
1.4 References	05
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	
2.1 Introduction	09
2.2 A review of literature on the land treatment of farm dairy effluent in New Zealand and its impact on water quality	10
2.2.1 <i>Abstract</i>	10
2.2.2 <i>Introduction</i>	11
2.2.3 <i>System design</i>	13
2.2.4 <i>Pasture growth response</i>	15
2.2.5 <i>Contamination of surface water by pathogens in FDE</i>	16
2.2.6 <i>Nutrient leaching losses resulting from application of FDE</i>	18
2.2.7 <i>Implications for water quality</i>	24
2.2.8 <i>Considerations for improved FDE land application</i>	25
2.2.9 <i>Summary</i>	28
2.2.10 <i>Acknowledgements</i>	29
2.2.11 <i>References</i>	29
2.3 The impact of intensive dairy farming on nutrient losses in drainage water from pastoral land	35
2.3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	35
2.3.2 <i>Dairy livestock</i>	36
2.3.2.1 <i>Losses of nitrogen as a result of grazing dairy cattle</i>	36
2.3.2.2 <i>Losses of phosphorus as a result of grazing dairy cattle</i>	40

2.3.2.3 Land use intensity	43
2.3.3 <i>Fertiliser application</i>	44
2.3.3.1 Losses of nitrogen as a result of N fertiliser additions	44
2.3.3.2 Losses of phosphorus as a result of P fertiliser additions	47
2.3.4 <i>Summary</i>	48
2.3.5 <i>References</i>	48

3. THE RESEARCH SITE

3.1 Introduction	55
3.2 Site and soil	55
3.3 Experimental design	56
3.4 Research reporting	59
3.4 References	60

4. MINIMISING SURFACE WATER POLLUTION RESULTING FROM FARM DAIRY EFFLUENT APPLICATION TO MOLE-PIPE DRAINED SOILS: AN EVALUATION OF THE DEFERRED IRRIGATION SYSTEM FOR SUSTAINABLE LAND TREATMENT IN THE MANAWATU

4.1 Abstract	61
4.2 Introduction	62
4.3 Materials and methods	65
4.3.1 <i>Site and soil</i>	65
4.3.2 <i>Experimental procedure</i>	66
4.3.3 <i>Nutrient analyses</i>	67
4.4 Results and discussion	68
4.4.1 <i>Theoretical analysis of two effluent treatment systems</i>	68
4.4.1.1 Two-pond treatment of FDE and discharge to surface water	68
4.4.1.2 Daily spray irrigation of FDE	68
4.4.2 <i>Spray irrigation of FDE to wet soils</i>	70
4.4.3 <i>Principles of deferred irrigation</i>	72
4.4.4 <i>Measuring drainage and nutrient losses of farm dairy effluent under the deferred irrigation system</i>	73
4.5 Conclusions	76
4.6 Acknowledgements	77
4.7 References	77

**5. THE PERFORMANCE OF TRAVELLING EFFLUENT IRRIGATORS:
ASSESSMENT, MODIFICATION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR NUTRIENT LOSS IN
DRAINAGE WATER**

5.1 Abstract	81
5.2 Introduction	82
5.3 Materials and methods	83
5.3.1 <i>Experimental procedure</i>	83
5.4 Results and discussion	86
5.4.1 <i>Assessing irrigator performance</i>	86
5.4.2 <i>Modification of existing hardware to improve uniformity of application</i>	89
5.4.3 <i>New technology to improve uniformity of application</i>	90
5.4.4 <i>Predicting drainage of partially-treated FDE induced by different irrigators</i>	92
5.4.5 <i>Quantifying operational days during early lactation for different irrigators</i>	94
5.5 Conclusions	95
5.6 Acknowledgements	96
5.7 References	96

**6. THE IMPACT OF INTENSIVE DAIRY FARMING ON THE LEACHING LOSSES OF
NITROGEN AND PHOSPHORUS FROM A MOLE AND PIPE DRAINED SOIL.**

6.1 Abstract	99
6.2 Introduction	100
6.3 Materials and methods	101
6.4 Results and discussion	103
6.4.1 <i>Effluent irrigation</i>	103
6.4.2 <i>Drainage quantity</i>	103
6.4.3 <i>Drainage losses of N</i>	105
6.4.4 <i>Drainage losses of P</i>	107
6.5 Summary and conclusions	109
6.6 Acknowledgements	110
6.7 References	110

7. THE EFFECTS OF DAIRY FARM MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON NUTRIENT ENRICHMENT OF MOLE AND PIPE DRAINAGE AND SURFACE RUNOFF.

7.1 Abstract	113
7.2 Introduction	114
7.3 Materials and methods	116
7.3.1 <i>Site and soil</i>	116
7.3.2 <i>Experimental design</i>	116
7.3.3 <i>Experimental procedure</i>	117
7.3.4 <i>Nutrient analysis</i>	118
7.4 Results and discussion	119
7.4.1 <i>Drainage and runoff quantity</i>	119
7.4.2 <i>Observed and predicted drainage volumes</i>	122
7.4.3 <i>Nutrient loss from non-effluent plots</i>	124
7.4.4 <i>Direct effects of FDE on drainage and surface runoff water quality</i>	129
7.4.5 <i>Indirect effects of deferred irrigation of FDE on drainage and surface runoff water quality</i>	132
7.4.6 <i>Effects of winter cattle grazing on drainage and surface runoff water quality</i>	134
7.4.7 <i>Effects of winter and spring urea applications on drainage water quality</i>	136
7.5 Summary and conclusions	137
7.6 Acknowledgements	138
7.7 References	138

8. NITROGEN LOSSES IN ARTIFICIAL DRAINAGE AND SURFACE RUNOFF FOLLOWING GRAZING BY DAIRY CATTLE

8.1 Abstract	145
8.2 Introduction	146
8.3 Materials and methods	148
8.3.1 <i>Site and soil</i>	148
8.3.2 <i>Experimental procedure</i>	148
8.3.3 <i>Laboratory analyses</i>	149
8.4 Results and discussion	149
8.5 Summary and conclusions	154
8.6 Acknowledgements	155
8.7 References	155

9.0 IMPLEMENTING DEFERRED IRRIGATION OF FARM DAIRY EFFLUENT USING APSIM

9.1 Introduction	159
9.2 Methodology	159
9.2.1 <i>Model setup</i>	159
9.2.2 <i>Model validation</i>	160
9.2.3 <i>Model scenarios</i>	161
9.3 Results and discussion	163
9.4 Conclusions	173
9.5 References	173

10. WHOLE-FARM NUTRIENT LOSS

10.1 Introduction	175
10.2 Methodology	175
10.3 Results and discussion	176
10.4 Conclusions	179
10.5 References	180

11. SUMMARY

11.1 Introduction	181
11.2 FDE management using deferred irrigation	181
11.3 FDE irrigator performance	183
11.4 Nutrient losses under intensive dairy farming	183
11.5 Further work	186
11.6 References	187

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Plot variability	189
Appendix 2: APSIM description and testing	193
Appendix 3: APSIM pond manager	209

LIST OF FIGURES

- Figure 2.1.** The trends in drainage NO_3^- -N concentration with total amount of accumulated drainage, in both the non-effluent and effluent plots. Error bars represent two SEM (Houlbrooke *et al.* 2003). 20
- Figure 2.2.** The impacts of effluent irrigation on dissolved inorganic P concentrations. Error bars represent two SEM (Houlbrooke *et al.* 2003). 20
- Figure 2.3** Mean NO_3^- -N concentration in two different mole and pipe drainage plots before and after a cattle grazing and urea application (Area A dotted line; area B solid line). Redrawn from Sharpley and Syers 1979. 38
- Figure 2.4** Mean DIP concentration in two different mole and pipe drainage plots before and after a cattle grazing and urea application (Area A dotted line; area B solid line). Redrawn from Sharpley and Syers (1979). 41
- Figure 3.1** Diagram showing a typical mole and pipe drained soil profile 57
- Figure 3.2** A schematic diagram of the field research site. Plots 1-4 represent standard farm practise at No 4 dairy farm whilst plots 5-8 represent standard farm practise plus FDE applications. 58
- Figure 4.1.** The timing of irrigations during the 2001/02 season when regular spring and summer rainfall meant that soil moisture deficits remained small throughout the summer. 75
- Figure 5.1.** Standard travelling irrigator with an additional irrigation bar strapped to the middle of the irrigator. Water is diverted to the bar from the main pipe line. 85
- Figure 5.2.** Profiles for the depth of FDE applied by a standard rotating irrigator under relatively calm conditions and cross wind conditions and after modifying the irrigator with either vertical splash plates or a diverting bar. Thin horizontal arrow indicates wind direction for 4 m sec^{-1} cross wind profile. Bold vertical arrow indicates the axis of the irrigator. 87
- Figure 5.3.** The circular pattern of FDE application under the rotating irrigator, showing how areas at the outer edge (furthest from the line of travel of irrigator) are under FDE spray swath for longer periods and so receive more FDE. 88
- Figure 5.4.** Profile for the depth of FDE applied by the oscillating irrigator under contrasting wind conditions. Thin horizontal arrow indicates wind direction for 6 m sec^{-1} cross wind profile. Bold vertical arrow indicates 91

the axis of the irrigator.

- Figure 5.5.** Percentage of FDE drainage likely under a range of different soil water deficits (SWD) following a mean application of 25 mm of FDE from rotating and oscillating irrigators. 93
- Figure 6.1.** Fifty year mean monthly rainfall during the winter/early spring period for the Manawatu compared with winter/early spring rainfall during 2002. 103
- Figure 6.2.** Typical hydrograph for one of the plots during the winter/spring period of 2002. 104
- Figure 6.3.** Cumulative drainage from the plots in the winter/spring period of 2002. 104
- Figure 6.4.** The trends in drainage NO_3^- -N concentration with total amount of accumulated drainage, showing the impact of cattle grazing events in both the non-effluent and effluent plots (bold arrows) and an application of urea at a rate of 37 kg N ha^{-1} to the effluent plots (grey arrow). Error bars represent two SEM. 107
- Figure 6.5.** The impacts of cattle grazing events and effluent irrigation on DIP concentrations. (Bold arrows positioned on the x-axis represent the timing of grazing events relative to cumulative drainage). Error bars represent two SEM. 109
- Figure 7.1.** Rainfall at the research site during 2003 compared with the fifty-year mean monthly rainfall for the January - October period for the Manawatu. Error bars represent the 90% upper percentile and 10% lower percentile of mean monthly rainfall. 119
- Figure 7.2** Simulated soil water deficit using a soil water balance model (Scotter *et al.* 1979b) at the research site for an 18 month period from July 2002 to January 2004. 120
- Figure 7.3** Drainage and runoff rates during the 2003 drainage season. 121
- Figure 7.4** Cumulative drainage from the plots in 2003. 122
- Figure 7.5** A comparison of actual cumulative drainage and surface runoff with simulated cumulative drainage and runoff using a soil water balance following the attainment of field capacity in June 2003. 123
- Figure 7.6** An example of the influence of rain intensity and quantity on runoff and drainage rates when the soil was at field capacity. 124
- Figure 7.7** The trends in the NO_3^- -N and DIP concentration of drainage water with the total amount of accumulated drainage. The poorly timed mid-September

application of FDE occurred at c. 140 mm cumulative drainage. The broken line within the non-effluent plots covers the period of drainage within the effluent plots due to the mid September application. Error bars represent two SEM.	122
Figure 7.8 The concentrations and forms of N, P and solids with cumulative drainage (0-10 mm) from a poorly timed application of FDE on 15/09/03 and cumulative drainage (10-21 mm) induced by rainfall one day later on 16/09/03.	125
Figure 8.1. The change in concentrations of different forms of N with cumulative drainage from a natural rainfall event (Experiment 1) on 06/06/03 for (a) freshly grazed plots and (b) plots that had been grazed 7 days before. Bars represent two SEM.	150
Figure 8.2. The change in concentrations of different forms of N with cumulative drainage from two artificial rainfall events (Experiment 2) on (a) 07/10/03 for freshly grazed plots and (b) 09/10/03 for the same plots two days following grazing. Bars represent two SEM.	152
Figure 8.3. The change in concentrations of forms of N with cumulative runoff from two artificial rainfall events (Experiment 2) on (a) 07/10/03 for freshly grazed plots and (b) 09/10/03 for the same plots two days following grazing. Bars represent two SEM.	153
Figure 8.4 The change in concentrations of total-N and NO_3^- -N (averaged for each drainage event) throughout the 2003 winter-spring drainage season. Arrows indicate when Experiments 1 & 2 occurred in relation to the winter-spring drainage period. The average total-N concentration of drainage from freshly grazed plots in Experiment 2 is indicated by an isolated solid triangle, as it involved an artificial rainfall event. Bars represent two SEM.	154
Figure 9.1. Simulated soil water deficits and 15 mm irrigation events over 30 years.	163
Figure 9.2. Simulated soil water deficits and 15 mm irrigation events over 3 years (1975-1978).	164
Figure 9.3. Simulated soil water deficits and 30 mm irrigation events over 30 years (1974-2003).	166
Figure 9.4. Simulated soil water deficits and 30 mm irrigation events over 3 years (1975-1978).	166
Figure 9.5. Simulated soil water deficits and 45 mm irrigation events over 30 years.	168
Figure 9.6. Simulated soil water deficits and 45 mm irrigation events over 3 years (1975-1978).	168

Figure 9.7. Simulated soil water deficits and 15 mm irrigation events with feed-pad and dairy shed rainfall diverted over 30 years.	170
Figure 9.8. Simulated soil water deficits and 15 mm irrigation events with feed-pad and dairy shed rainfall diverted over 3 years (1975-1978).	172
Figure A1. Cumulative drainage from the plots in the winter/spring period of 2003 plotted against calculated cumulative loss.	190
Figure A2. NO ₃ ⁻ -N concentration from individual plots vs. cumulative drainage for the winter-spring period of 2002.	191
Figure A3. DIP concentration from individual plots vs. cumulative drainage for the winter-spring period of 2002.	191
Figure A4. NO ₃ ⁻ -N concentration from individual plots vs. cumulative drainage for the winter-spring period of 2003.	192
Figure A5. DIP concentration from individual plots vs. cumulative drainage for the winter-spring period of 2003.	192
Figure A6. Soil water retention and hydraulic conductivity and wet-end hydraulic conductivity as calculated by Hyprops from the data in Table A1.	197
Figure A7. Soil water deficit to 1.7 m deep as measured by Scotter <i>et al.</i> (1979b) data (points and 1 standard deviation) and predicted by the Two-Zone model (dotted line) and APSIM (solid line).	199
Figure A8. Soil water deficit measured to 1.0 m deep as measured by Barker <i>et al.</i> 's (1985) irrigated (open points) and stressed data (solid points) with the APSIM predictions (lines).	201
Figure A9. Selected depth profiles from Barker <i>et al.</i> 's (1985) stressed data (points) with the APSIM predictions (lines) and the limits of plant-available soil water (grey shaded area).	201
Figure A10. Cumulative drainage (solid points) and runoff (open points) from Houlbrooke's plots and APSIM's predictions (lines).	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1. The amount of N loss from a range of different applications rates and forms of farm dairy effluent.	27
Table 2.2. Mean concentration and annual loss of different forms of N & P from mole and pipe drained cattle grazed pasture plots on a mixture of Pallic and Brown soil in Eastern Southland. Brackets denote one SEM. (Modified from Monaghan <i>et al.</i> 2002).	39
Table 2.3. Annual loss ($\text{kg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$) of total P (TP) and dissolved reactive P (DRP from mole and pipe drained cattle grazed pasture plots on a mixture of Pallic and Brown soil in Eastern Southland (Modified from Monaghan <i>et al.</i> 2005).	42
Table 2.4 The amount of N loss from a range of different applications rates and forms of N fertiliser.	46
Table 4.1. Average flow weighted nutrient concentrations of the applied FDE, drainage, and surface runoff associated with an irrigation of FDE when the soil was close to field capacity in September 2003. Values in brackets indicate SEM from four replicates.	71
Table 4.2. Nutrient inputs and drainage and surface runoff losses resulting from a single irrigation of FDE in September 2003 when the soil was close to field capacity.	71
Table 4.3. The mean depth of FDE applied by the irrigator at each of the irrigations, the soil moisture deficit at the commencement of irrigation, the average drainage from all plots over three lactation seasons (2000/01 – 2002/03), and the maximum drainage from any single plot as a proportion of the applied FDE (i.e. representing the 'worst case' scenario).	74
Table 5.1. Swath width, travel speed and average rate of application for a range of irrigator configurations and types applying farm-dairy effluent at a mean depth of 15 mm.	89
Table 5.2. The predicted direct drainage loss of farm-dairy effluent volume and nutrients under a range of different irrigator and soil moisture scenarios for an average application depth of 25 mm, under relatively calm wind conditions.	93

Table 5.3. The estimated minimum soil water deficit (SWD) required to avoid drainage from different irrigator scenarios set at their fastest travel speed and hence lowest application depth. The average days above the minimum SWD is calculated for the period during early lactation (August-October) from deficits calculated for the springs of 2000 - 2003.	95
Table 6.1. The amounts and forms of N lost in winter drainage. SEM of annual loss and concentration data are presented in brackets.	106
Table 6.2. The amounts and forms of P lost in winter drainage. SEM of annual loss and concentration data are presented in brackets.	107
Table 7.1. The amounts and forms of N lost in 2003 winter drainage and surface runoff. SEM of annual loss and concentration data are presented in brackets. SEM is calculated from four plots on the non-effluent drainage plots, two plots on the effluent drainage plots and non-effluent surface runoff plots and not calculated for the un-replicated effluent surface runoff plot.	125
Table 7.2. The amounts and forms of P lost in 2003 winter drainage. SEM of annual loss and concentration data are presented in brackets. SEM is calculated from four plots on the non-effluent drainage plots, two plots on the effluent drainage plots and non-effluent surface runoff plots and not calculated for the un-replicated effluent surface runoff plot.	126
Table 8.1. Mean concentrations and losses of different forms of N in drainage on 06/06/03 (Experiment 1) from plots that had been freshly grazed compared with plots that had been grazed 7 days before the drainage event. Standard errors of means (SEM) are presented in brackets. TN = total N, TON = total organic N.	151
Table 9.1. Yearly irrigation simulation data from applications of 15 mm of FDE.	165
Table 9.2. Yearly irrigation simulation data from applications of 30 mm of FDE.	167
Table 9.3. Yearly irrigation simulation data from applications of 45 mm of FDE.	169
Table 9.4. Yearly irrigation simulation data from applications of 15 mm of FDE with all rainfall on the dairy shed and feed-pad diverted.	171
Table 9.5. Summary of irrigation data from four different simulations. 15 mm of rainfall represents the rainfall divert scenario.	173
Table 10.1. Source of nutrient losses reported for three different FDE management scenarios	177
Table 10.2. Whole farm losses of N in drainage and from treatment ponds under three different FDE management scenarios.	177

Table 10.3. Whole farm losses of P in drainage and from treatment ponds under three different FDE management scenarios.	178
Table A.1. Soil hydraulic properties for the Tokomaru Silt Loam.	196
Table A2. Measured and predicted runoff events.	203

LIST OF PLATES

- Plate 3.1** A v-notch weir placed within an excavated pit and fitted with a data-logger to measure stage height of any exiting pipe drainage. 58
- Plate 3.2** Installation of a 50 m² surface runoff plot. The plots were hydrologically isolated with buried boards. Runoff was collected by guttering placed at the down-slope edge of the plot. Runoff water was conveyed to the adjacent pit where it was measured. 59
- Plate 3.3** A one litre tipping bucket fitted with a data logger to measure flow rate from the surface runoff plots. 59
- Plate 5.1.** Splash plate strapped on to the end of a rotating boom arm of a standard rotating irrigator. 85
- Plate 5.2.** Mark 1 'Spitfire' oscillating irrigator in operation with single boom and flick nozzle to achieve 180° coverage. 86