

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.

MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND TECHNOLOGIES FOR
REDUCING NITROGEN AND PHOSPHORUS LOSSES
FROM SOILS RECEIVING FARM DAIRY EFFLUENT

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

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Soil Science




MASSEY UNIVERSITY

Palmerston North, New Zealand


James Anthony Hanly

2012



*This thesis is dedicated to my wife Jolanda,
and my children Nicholas and Jasmine.*

*Thank you for your encouragement,
inspiration and love!*



ABSTRACT

The loss of nutrients to the aquatic environment caused by the irrigation of farm dairy effluent (FDE) is a prominent and contentious feature of dairy farming in New Zealand. This thesis investigates management practices and technologies with potential to reduce nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) losses in drainage water from mole and pipe drained dairy pasture soils irrigated with FDE.

Farm dairy effluent management was both monitored, using remote sensing technologies, and modelled on a case study farm. During the winter and spring of 2008, an estimated 7,890 m³ of FDE was applied in excess of the soil water deficit (SWD). System constraints were the cause of about two-thirds (5,070 m³) of this over-applied FDE volume. It was estimated that as much as 502 kg TN and 83 kg TP could have been lost to surface waters due to inadequate infrastructure. The two main system constraints were the farm's insufficient FDE storage capacity (2,000 m³) and the inability of the farm's irrigator to apply small application depths (<8 mm). Furthermore, this study highlighted the significant loss of nutrients that can occur under FDE irrigation and reinforced the need for tools to assist farmers with FDE management.

A number of tools were developed to help farmers manage FDE irrigation. The use of a soil water balance, incorporating actual farm daily rainfall, is an effective method for informing the scheduling of FDE irrigations. Also, the risk of over-application of FDE to soils caused by travelling irrigator breakdowns or stoppages was substantially reduced by the use of a breakdown alert and automatic shut-off system developed and evaluated in this study.

Given the elevated risk of P losses from soils treated with FDE, a method of capturing P from drainage waters was investigated. A field experiment was conducted to quantify the ability of Papakai tephra, installed into mole and pipe drainage systems, to remove P from drainage waters. This drainage system reduced TP losses in drainage by about 50% (c. 0.14 kg P/ha) over a drainage season, which equated to a 2.8 kg P reduction for a 20-hectare effluent block.

As farmers frequently crop effluent block soils, the effect of summer forage cropping on nutrient losses was quantified. The practice of spring cultivating long-term dairy pasture, summer forage cropping and autumn regrassing increased the quantity of TN measured in drainage water, over three drainage seasons (2006 to 2008), by 84% (21 kg N/ha), compared to long-term pasture. If this study had commenced in spring with a more typical pattern of rainfall and drainage, this increase is estimated to have only been about 23.7% (5.9 kg N/ha). Based on these results, summer forage cropping is estimated to increase whole-farm drainage water N losses by about 5%, when 10% of a farm's area is cultivated each year.

Of the management practices and technologies studied, the greatest opportunity to reduce the losses of N and P to surface water from the case study farm's effluent block, is through investment in FDE system infrastructure, particularly adequate storage capacity, and the use of decision support and fail-safe tools to assist the implementation of *deficit irrigation* of FDE.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people I want to acknowledge and thank for their contribution to this research study. Firstly, I thank Professor Mike Hedley, my principle PhD supervisor, for providing me with the opportunity to undertake this PhD study. Mike's excellent guidance, continual support and feedback at various stages during this research study and thesis writing have been extremely valuable. This thesis has also benefited considerably from the advice and support I received of Associate Professor Dave Horne, my second PhD supervisor. Dave's openness to discuss ideas and provide useful feedback is greatly appreciated.

I also thank my colleagues in the Institute of Natural Resources, Massey University, for their support. I especially thank; Lance Currie for managing the financial and technical support requirements of my research projects; Bob Toes for always being available to help and provide useful technical advice with experimental work; Ross Wallace, Ian Furkert, Glenys Wallace, Mark Osborne, Manuel Bermudez, Leighton Parker and Linda Yates for their assistance with laboratory and field work; Anne West for her guidance with statisitcal analysis; Dave Scotter for providing soil water balance information; Mike Bretherton for providing software programming expertise; Christine Christensen for her editorial feedback; and Liza Haarhoff for helping prepare this thesis for printing.

I want to acknowledge the staff of Massey University's Farm Services and No.4 Dairy Farm for their assistance with field trials, and Mark Carter (DataCarter Ltd) for helping with the development of the irrigator fail-safe system. The research presented in this thesis has also benefited from the financial support and/or services provided by the following organisations; Fertilizer & Lime Research Centre (Massey University), Dairy Insight, Sustainable Farming Fund (MAF), DairyNZ, Harmonic Ltd, Horizons Regional Council, and Baycity Technologies Ltd.

I greatly appreciate the support and encouragement I have received from family and friends. Most importantly I thank Jolanda, my wife, for her love and understanding; and Nicholas and Jasmine, my children, for their patience and inspiration. I am also grateful to my parents, Brian and Anita, and my parents-in-law, Martin and Pita, for their support and care; and John Koolaard for providing helpful statistical advice and

encouragement. I also want to acknowledge Kelvin Squire, my intermediate level schoolteacher, who's enthusiastic and inspirational teaching, and encouragement has had a significant influence on my educational aspirations ever since.

Ultimately, I thank our Creator for bringing into existence the astonishingly wondrous and beautiful world and universe we live in. In every aspect, I observe remarkable complexity, design and order, which not only make scientific inquiry possible but also fascinating and purposeful. I also thank Him for providing, through His Son, the values of integrity, grace and hope, which are the foundations of a meaningful life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: Introduction	1
1.1 Reasons for the study	1
1.2 Research focus and objectives	4
1.3 Thesis structure	4
1.4 References	6
CHAPTER 2: Literature review	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Implementing deficit irrigation to minimise the risk of FDE-induced surface runoff and drainage.....	12
2.2.1 FDE-induced surface runoff and/or drainage	12
2.2.2 Soil and landscape risk factors.....	14
2.2.3 Soil moisture conditions	14
2.2.4 FDE irrigator performance.....	15
2.2.5 Deficit irrigation of FDE	16
2.2.6 Research needs.....	18
2.3 Losses of P in seasonal drainage waters from artificially drained effluent block soils and the potential for using “end of pipe” treatment methods for P removal.....	19
2.3.1 Prior research	19
2.3.2 P removal systems	20
2.3.3 High capacity P sorbing/precipitating materials.....	21
2.4 Management of unwanted nutrient accumulation on soils used for land treatment of FDE	26
2.4.1 Using forage cropping to accumulate supplementary feed and lower potassium levels in effluent block soils	27
2.4.2 Risk of accelerated N loss as a consequence of forage crop cultivation	27
2.5 Summary.....	30
2.6 References	31
CHAPTER 3: Tools for informing the design and management of deficit irrigation FDE land treatment systems	41
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Materials and methods	44
3.2.1 Case study farm	44
3.2.2 Monitoring and measurement	45

3.2.3	Survey farms	48
3.2.4	Modelling	49
3.3	Results and discussion	49
3.3.1	Conceptual decision support management system for FDE land treatment	49
3.3.2	Determining farm-specific FDE storage requirements.....	51
3.3.3	Methods for providing farms with accurate daily SWD information	68
3.3.4	FDE travelling irrigator reliability and recording.....	78
3.4	Conclusions	83
3.5	References.....	85
CHAPTER 4: Implementing deficit irrigation of farm dairy effluent at a farm scale - a		
Manawatu case study.....		
4.1	Introduction	89
4.2	Materials and methods.....	92
4.2.1	The case study farm	92
4.2.2	Monitoring and measurement.....	92
4.2.3	Model parameters	94
4.3	Results and discussion	94
4.3.1	Rainfall 2008 and 2009	94
4.3.2	System constraints	95
4.4	Conclusions	106
4.5	References.....	106
CHAPTER 5: Evaluation of tephra for removing phosphorus from dairy farm drainage		
waters.....		
5.1	Introduction	109
5.2	Materials and methods.....	112
5.2.1	Laboratory study	112
5.2.2	Field Study.....	115
5.3	Results and discussion	117
5.3.1	Flow rate potential of tephra filled mole channels.....	117
5.3.2	Column experiment 1 – phosphorus adsorption capacity of materials	118
5.3.3	Column experiment 2 - factors affecting phosphorus adsorption efficiency.....	120
5.3.4	Field Trial.....	124
5.4	Summary and conclusions	129
5.5	References.....	130

CHAPTER 6: Effect of cultivating long-term dairy pasture, summer forage cropping and autumn pasture renewal on nitrate leaching in the Manawatu	135
6.1 Introduction	135
6.2 Material and methods.....	138
6.2.1 Trial site, treatments and grazing management.....	138
6.2.2 Herbage sampling and analysis	141
6.2.3 Drainage water flow rate and volume measurements.....	142
6.2.4 Drainage water nitrogen and phosphorus analysis	143
6.2.5 Statistical analysis.....	143
6.2.6 Rainfall and drainage	143
6.2.7 Turnip crop yield and grazing utilisation	146
6.2.8 Nitrogen losses in drainage water	146
6.2.9 Phosphorus losses in drainage water (2006-2008).....	152
6.2.10 Comparisons with whole-farm N leaching and OVERSEER® Nutrient Budgets model.....	152
6.2.11 Nitrate concentrations in re-sown ryegrass-clover pastures	154
6.2.12 Mitigating N leaching from forage cropping	154
6.3 Conclusions	154
6.4 References	155
CHAPTER 7: Summary	161
7.1 Introduction	161
7.2 Tools for informing the design and management of deficit irrigation FDE land treatment systems (Chapter 3)	162
7.3 Implementing deficit irrigation of farm dairy effluent at a farm scale – a Manawatu case study (Chapter 4)	163
7.4 Evaluation of tephra for removing phosphorus from dairy farm drainage waters (Chapter 5).....	165
7.5 Effect of cultivating long-term dairy pasture, summer forage cropping and autumn pasture renewal on nitrate leaching in the Manawatu Region (Chapter 6)	166
7.6 Potential for management of the effluent block to influence whole-farm N and P losses in surface runoff and drainage	168
7.7 Further research.....	170
7.8 References	171
APPENDIX: The farm dairy effluent storage calculator –	173

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1	An overview of the four main research chapters comprising this thesis.	5
Figure 2.1	Relationship between equilibrium solution P (mg P/L) and adsorbed P (g/kg slag) for blast furnace slag (adapted from Sakadevan & Bavor, 1998).	24
Figure 3.1	Components of a conceptual FDE land application decision support management system.	50
Figure 3.2	FDE level in the second treatment pond at the case study farm (pond level is the distance that the FDE level is below the overflow point; FDWU means farm dairy water use).	53
Figure 3.3	The contribution of different sources to FDE generation on the case study farm on during the winter and spring of 2008.	57
Figure 3.4	The volumes of storage required by <i>Farm 1</i> to practice <i>deficit irrigation</i> ('adequate' storage), as determined by the <i>FDE Storage Calculator</i> . <i>Horizontal line indicates current storage capacity</i> .	62
Figure 3.5	The volumes of storage required by <i>Farm 2</i> to practice <i>deficit irrigation</i> ('adequate' storage), as determined by the <i>FDE Storage Calculator</i> . <i>Horizontal line indicates current storage capacity</i>	62
Figure 3.6	The volumes of storage required by <i>Farm 3</i> to practice <i>deficit irrigation</i> ('adequate' storage), as determined by the <i>FDE Storage Calculator</i> . <i>Horizontal line indicates current storage capacity</i> .	63
Figure 3.7	The volumes of storage required by <i>Farm 4</i> to practice <i>deficit irrigation</i> ('adequate' storage), as determined by the <i>FDE Storage Calculator</i> . <i>Horizontal line indicates current storage capacity</i> .	64
Figure 3.8	The volumes of storage required by <i>Farm 5</i> to practice <i>deficit irrigation</i> ('adequate' storage), as determined by the <i>FDE Storage Calculator</i> . <i>Horizontal line indicates current storage capacity</i> .	64
Figure 3.9	Change in FDE level of the case study farm's FDE storage pond, measured with an ultra-sonic pond level sensor from mid-summer to the end of autumn 2011.	68
Figure 3.10	Daily rainfall and drainage measured at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm and SWD estimated using a soil water balance model (SWD restricted to 75 mm) during 2006.	70
Figure 3.11	Daily rainfall and drainage measured at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm and SWD estimated using a soil water balance model (SWD restricted to 75 mm) during 2007.	70

Figure 3.12	Measured daily drainage and estimated SWD using rainfall measured at Massey University No.4 Dairy Farm and at a Palmerston North (PN) weather station (8 km from the farm), during winter and spring 2007.	72
Figure 3.13	Daily drainage measured at Massey University No.4 Dairy Farm and SWD values estimated using farm rainfall and either 2006 district ET rates or long-term average district ET rates (10 years; 1996-2005) for each calendar day.	73
Figure 3.14	Daily drainage measured at Massey University No.4 Dairy Farm and SWD values estimated using farm rainfall and either 2007 district ET rates or long-term average district ET rates (10 years; 1996-2005) for each calendar day.	73
Figure 3.15	Aquaflex soil moisture sensor readings from a mole and pipe drained soil at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm, during winter and spring 2007.	75
Figure 3.16	Measured daily drainage, soil water balance and Aquaflex soil moisture sensor readings on a mole and pipe drained soil at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm, during winter and spring 2007.	75
Figure 3.17	Measured daily drainage and Aquaflex soil moisture sensor readings on a mole and pipe drained soil at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm, during winter and spring 2006.	77
Figure 3.18	Measured daily drainage and Aquaflex soil moisture sensor readings on a mole and pipe drained soil at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm, during winter and spring 2007.	77
Figure 4.1	Mean monthly rainfall for Palmerston North and monthly rainfall or the case study farm during 2008 and 2009.	95
Figure 4.2	The key features of FDE land treatment system, as practiced on the case study farm during winter and spring of 2008 (<i>Scenario 1</i>), and in relation to soil moisture conditions (pond maximum storage capacity = 2,000 m ³).	97
Figure 4.3	Modelled components of the FDE land treatment system for the case study farm, during the winter and spring of 2008, using the 'optimal' management criteria outlined in <i>Scenario 2</i> (pond maximum storage capacity = 2,000 m ³).	99
Figure 4.4	The key features of FDE land treatment system, as practised on the case study farm during winter and spring of 2009 (<i>Scenario 3</i>), following an enlargement of pond to a maximum storage capacity of 6,000 m ³ , and in relation to soil moisture conditions. The irrigation system was changed from a travelling irrigator to a sprinkler irrigator in mid-September.	101

Figure 4.5	Modelled components of the FDE land treatment system for the case study farm, during the winter and spring of 2009, using the ‘optimal’ management criteria outlined in <i>Scenario 4</i> . This scenario models the impact of the enlarged storage capacity of 6,000 m ³ storage capacity combined with use of a rotating travelling irrigator.	103
Figure 4.6	Modelled components of the FDE land treatment system for the case study farm, during the winter and spring of 2009, using the ‘optimal’ management criteria outlined in <i>Scenario 5</i> . This scenario models the impact of the enlarged storage capacity of 6,000 m ³ storage capacity combined with use of a sprinkler irrigator.	104
Figure 5.1	Mean estimated P adsorption by 0.25-1 mm Papakai tephra, 1-2 mm Papakai tephra, and 1-2 mm Patua soil, compared with solution final P concentration (12 mg P/L influent solution concentration, c.35 minute residence time within the column). Lines are fitted Freundlich equations.	119
Figure 5.2	Mean estimated P adsorbed by 0.25-1 mm Papakai tephra, 1-2 mm Papakai tephra and 1-2 mm Patua soil, compared to the quantity of P added to the column (12 mg P/L influent solution concentration, c. 35 minute residence time within the column).	121
Figure 5.3	Mean estimated P adsorbed by 1-4 mm Papakai tephra from four different influent solutions, compared to the quantity of P added to the column.	121
Figure 5.4	Palmerston North mean monthly rainfall (30 year means;1971-2000) and monthly rainfall and estimated evapotranspiration for the field trial site during 2005.	125
Figure 5.5	Daily rainfall, daily drainage and predicted soil water balance for the field trial site during the 2005 drainage season.	125
Figure 5.6	Mean monthly DRP and TP concentrations and losses in drainage water from the three drainage treatments in 2005 (error bars represent \pm standard error of means).	126
Figure 6.1	Crop calendar for the <i>CP</i> treatment plots.	140
Figure 6.2	Mean monthly rainfall for Palmerston North and monthly rainfall for the trial site during 2006, 2007 and 2008.	144
Figure 6.3	Daily rainfall and estimated soil water deficits at the field trial site during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 drainage seasons.	145
Figure 6.4	Mean measured cumulative drainage and drainage NO ₃ ⁻ -N concentrations for the <i>LP</i> and <i>CP</i> treatments during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 drainage seasons (<i>error bars represent \pm standard error of mean</i>).	147

Figure 6.5	Net cumulative total N loss (<i>CP</i> treatment minus <i>LP</i> treatment values) in cumulative drainage following treatment commencement (17 October 2006), during the 2006 drainage season.	149
Figure A.1	Input data required for Calculator to predict the volume of FDE produced each day due to washing of yards. The ‘milking time’ is required to calculate the reduction on FDE generated from the yards where diversion is practised.	178
Figure A.2	The input information required to predict the FDE generated from rainfall catchment on hard surfaces.	179
Figure A.3	Input information required to determine the surface area and the storage volume of current ponds on the farm.	180
Figure A.4a	Selection of site for the 30 years of rainfall data for daily soil water balance.	181
Figure A.4b	Map in the Calculator showing the location of the 37 sites. The user selects one of these sites by clicking on it.	182
Figure A.5	Input information related to irrigation of FDE, including the critical deficits at which irrigation(s) commence. The daily irrigation volumes are also entered here. If the critical deficits and irrigated volume are not unknown, the “help” tabs take the user to a series of look-up tables for assistance. The tab which activates the ‘extended’ storage option (i.e. no irrigation of FDE in the early part of the milking season) is also shown.	184
Figure A.6	The look-up tables that help the user identify the critical deficits T_1 and T_2 for the small rotating boom and Spitfire travelling irrigators.	184
Figure A.7	Identifying the irrigated volume using the pump rate and pumping time.	185
Figure A.8	Determining the volume of irrigated FDE using the dimensions of the irrigated area (i.e. the length of the run multiplied by the width of the wetted area) the number of runs and the irrigation depth (T_1 and T_2 from Figure A.5).	186
Figure A.9	The output window showing the maximum storage required for each of the milking seasons from 1976-77 to 2006-07 and the maximum storage for the period. If the farm has existing storage then it is also shown as a line for comparative purposes.	188

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	List of materials used in studies to assess their potential to remove P from solution.	22
Table 3.1	The sizes of rainfall catchment areas, on the case study farm, before and after storm water diversion.	54
Table 3.2	The influence of proposed system changes on FDE storage capacities required on the case study (highest storage capacity required in 30 years, 1977-2006).	59
Table 3.3	Farm details for each of the five survey farms.	61
Table 4.1	Summary of the five scenarios comparing the estimated volumes of FDE applied in excess of the SWD and the estimated quantities of TN and TP contained in each of the volumes.	105
Table 5.1	Particle size distribution and P retention of Papakai tephra.	112
Table 5.2	Effect of drainage treatments on mean DRP and TP concentrations and accumulated losses during the 2005 winter drainage season. The 10% LSD and <i>P</i> -value are presented for comparison between treatment means (<i>ns</i> , not significant).	127
Table 6.1	Average losses of N and P (kg/ha) measured in drainage from the <i>LP</i> and <i>CP</i> treatment plots during the 2006, 2007 and 2008 drainage seasons.	148
Table 6.2	Measured net cumulative total N losses (<i>CP</i> treatment values minus <i>LP</i> treatment values) in drainage after treatment commencement (17 October 2006).	150
Table 6.3	Estimated contribution turnip forage blocks to whole-farm average drainage water N losses.	153
Table 7.1	The comparison of management practices, assessed in this study, to influence whole-farm N and P losses in surface runoff and drainage.	169

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 3.1	An example of a tipping bucket flow meter and data logger used for measuring and recording drainage water flow rates.	46
Plate 3.2	An ultra-sonic pond level sensor and height gauge installed in the storage pond at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm.	46
Plate 3.3	The small travelling irrigator (rotating boom) with the alert and remote sensing equipment installed at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm (insert shows the combined cellular phone and GPS device).	47
Plate 3.4	The layout of all the rainfall catchment areas directing storm water into the FDE storage ponds on the case study farm in 2008 (refer to Table 3.1 for area descriptions).	54
Plate 3.5	Travelling irrigator GPS tracks that were recorded between 12 February and 11 March 2008 at Massey University's No.4 Dairy Farm.	81
Plate 5.1	Modified mole plough, with the added hopper and delivery chute, used to install tephra into mole channels.	116
Plate 6.1	Preparation of the soil using 'Dutch' harrows prior to sowing turnips on the <i>CP</i> treatment plots (14 December 2006).	139
Plate 6.2	Dairy cows strip-grazing turnips on the <i>CP</i> treatment plots.	140
Plate 6.3	Turnip crop residues sampled within a 1 m ² quadrat to assess turnip utilisation by dairy cows on a <i>CP</i> treatment plot.	142

