

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.

**INTERACTIONS BETWEEN FARM EFFLUENT APPLICATION
METHODS, TILLAGE PRACTICES AND SOIL NUTRIENTS**

**A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF APPLIED SCIENCE IN AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING AT
MASSEY UNIVERSITY, PALMERSTON NORTH,
NEW ZEALAND**

**HOANG SON
1998**

ABSTRACT

Land disposal of liquid effluent has benefits for the environment and is economically viable. Firstly, it can reduce nutrient levels from wastes polluting waterways. Secondly, the land application of effluent has been the most common treatment method because it can provide some necessary nutrients for plant growth. In New Zealand, land application of farm liquid effluent is a common method for disposing agricultural wastes. However, there is little comparative information about nutrient recycling in soils treated with effluent using surface application or subsurface injection.

A field trial was conducted to examine the effect of tillage on the transformation of nutrient added through dairyshed effluent. Liquid effluent was either injected at 10 cm depth or broadcast on the surface at the Massey University long-term tillage experiments which include permanent pasture, and crops sown with no-till and conventional tillage as main treatments. In the first experiment, raw dairyshed liquid effluent was applied in August 1997 at the rate of $120 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ (30 kg N ha^{-1} equivalent). This was considered as a low rate of application. In the second experiment starting in December 1997, the application was at the rate of $600 \text{ m}^3 \text{ ha}^{-1}$ (150 kg N ha^{-1}). At this rate, although the hydraulic loading was considered as a high rate, the nutrient loading was considered optimum.

Soil samples were collected before application, after one week, one month, and two months of application, at two depths: 0-10 cm and 10-20 cm and the samples were analysed for total N, total P, NO_3^- , NH_4^+ , exchangeable K, available Olsen-P. Throughout the experiments, interactions between nutrient status, methods of application and different tillage practices were analysed. In the case of injection method, soil samples were taken both in the centre of the injected row and 10cm horizontally away from the centre of row.

At the low rate of application (first experiment), soil nitrogen and phosphorus status did not change significantly for up to two months after application. Soil ammonium concentration reduced immediately after one week then reduced slowly. Nitrate concentration reduced slowly during the first month and significantly reduced during the second month after application. Exchangeable K and Olsen-P were not significantly different among treatments.

At the high rate of application (second experiment), levels of soil nitrogen and phosphorus reduced slightly after two months of application. Nitrate concentration in the soil increased in the first month, but steadily reduced during the second month. On the other hand, ammonium concentration reduced gradually over a period of two months. Ammonium in injected plots was higher than that in the broadcast plots. Pasture retained more ammonium concentration compared with no-till and conventional tillage plots. Moreover, nitrate content in the injection plots was similar to that in the broadcast. This may be related to low rainfall during the experiment period that may have restricted the denitrification and reduced nitrate losses through leaching.

Generally, there was higher content of exchangeable K and available P in soil which resulted from effluent application. Method of effluent application had no effects on K and P concentrations.

Overall, there was an increase in nutrients in soil after application of liquid effluent, especially at the topsoil. There was a greater retention of nutrients in no-till soil than the conventionally tilled soil. Subsoil injection of effluent allowed higher level of nutrient retention than the surface broadcast method. This may be due to reduced nitrogen losses caused by volatilization of ammonium.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly and most importantly, I would like to express my deep gratitude to my chief supervisor Dr. M. A. Choudhary and co-supervisor Dr. N. S. Bolan for their encouragement, continuing stimulation, enthusiastic supervision and valuable advice during my study.

I'm particularly indebted to Mr. Dexter McGhie, Mr. Leo Bolter, Mr. Gerard Harrigan, and Mr. Russell Watson in the Institute of Technology and Engineering, who helped to conduct field and laboratory experiments and construct research equipment' used in this study. My gratitude also goes to all staff and postgraduates in the Institute for their friendship and useful suggestions.

I would like to thank Bob Toes, Lance Currie, Mrs Glenys Wallace and Mr Mark Osborne in the Institute of Natural Resource, who helped me a lot during field and laboratory experiments.

Special thanks are due to the New Zealand Official Development Assistance (NZODA) Programme, New Zealand Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade for offering me a postgraduate scholarship.

I am also grateful to the Vietnamese Agricultural Engineering Institute for allowing me the opportunity to avail this scholarship.

Finally, I would like to say special word of thanks to my parents, and my friend, Phuong, who encouraged and supported me throughout my study.

**INTERACTIONS BETWEEN FARM EFFLUENT APPLICATION METHODS,
TILLAGE PRACTICES AND SOIL NUTRIENTS**

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xiii
Chapter 1 GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	5
Introduction.....	5
2. 1 Waste effluent in New Zealand.....	6
2. 1. 1 Industrial waste effluent	6
2. 1. 2 Municipal sewage effluent.....	6
2. 1. 3 Dairyshed effluent	7
2. 2 Farm effluent and its effects on soil and environment	9
2. 2. 1 Physical effects.....	9
2. 2. 2 Biological effects.....	10
2. 2. 3 Chemical effects.....	10
2. 2. 4 Social and health effects.....	10
2. 3 Effects of effluent application on grassland and fodder crops.....	11
2. 4 Effluent treatment systems	13

2. 4. 1 Ponds.....	13
2. 4. 2 Alternative treatment methods	13
2. 4. 3 Sequencing bath reactor	13
2. 4. 4 Land application	14
2. 5 Effluent as a source of fertiliser	14
2. 6 Methods of effluent land application.....	18
2. 6. 1 Broadcast method	18
2. 6. 1. 1 Benefits of broadcast method	18
2. 6. 1. 2 Spray irrigation.....	18
2. 6. 1. 3 Vehicle (Muck Tanker) spreading	19
2. 6. 1. 4 Land flooding (overland flow)	19
2. 6. 1. 5 Risks of surface land application.....	20
2. 6. 2 Subsoil injection.....	21
2. 6. 2. 1 Benefits of subsoil injection.....	23
2. 6. 2. 2 Limitations of injection method.....	25
2. 7 NZ Resource Management Act regulations.....	26
2. 8 Tillage and effluent effects on nutrient cycling.....	27
2. 8. 1 Purpose of tillage.....	27
2. 8. 1. 1 Type of tillage	27
Conventional tillage.....	27
Conservation tillage.....	28

No-tillage (direct drilling)	28
2. 8. 1. 2 Tillage effects on N transformation.....	30
2. 8. 2 Soil nutrients.....	31
2. 8. 2. 1 Soil nitrogen	31
2. 8. 2. 2 Ammonium volatilization and nitrate leaching.....	32
2. 8. 2. 3 Nitrogen recycling.....	35
3. 8. 2. 4 Soil phosphorus.....	36
2. 8. 2. 5 Phosphorus recycling.....	38
2. 8. 2. 6 Soil potassium	40
2. 8. 2. 7 Potassium recycling.....	41
2. 9 Summary.....	42
Chapter 3 MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	44
3. 1 Experimental layout.....	44
3. 2 Description of subsoil injector	44
3. 3 Application of liquid effluent.....	45
3.3.1 Field preparation for the experiment.....	45
3.3.2 Collection of liquid effluent.....	48
3.3.3 Experiment 1 Low rate of application during spring.....	48
3.3.4 Experiment 2 High rate of effluent application in summer	50
3. 4 Collection of soil samples.....	51
3. 5 Methods of analysis of soil and effluent	55

3. 5. 1 Total nitrogen and phosphorus measurement.....	55
3. 5. 2 Ammonium and nitrate measurement.....	55
3. 5. 3 Available phosphorus measurement.....	55
3. 5. 4 Exchangeable potassium measurement.....	56
3. 6 Data analysis.....	56
Chapter 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS.....	57
<i>4. 1 Experiment 1 Low rate of effluent application (in winter).....</i>	<i>57</i>
4.1.1 Effects of method of effluent application on soil nutrient contents	57
4. 1. 1. 1 Total nitrogen.....	58
4. 1. 1. 2 Ammonium.....	60
4. 1. 1. 3 Nitrate.....	63
4. 1. 1. 4 Total phosphorus.....	67
4. 1. 1. 5 Available phosphorus.....	68
4. 1. 1. 6 Exchangeable potassium.....	72
4. 1. 2 Effects of land preparation on soil nutrient contents.....	74
4. 1. 2. 1 Total nitrogen	74
4. 1. 2. 2 Ammonium.....	76
4. 1. 2. 3 Nitrate.....	78
4. 1. 2. 4 Total phosphorus.....	80
4. 1. 2. 5 Available phosphorus.....	81
4. 1. 2. 6 Exchangeable potassium.....	83

4. 1. 3 Summary	84
4. 2 Experiment 2 High rate of effluent application (in summer)	85
4. 2. 1 Placement method effects on nutrient content.....	86
4. 2. 1. 1 Total nitrogen.....	86
4. 2. 1. 2 Ammonium.....	88
4. 2. 1. 3 Nitrate	91
4. 2. 1. 4 Total phosphorus.....	94
4. 2. 1. 5 Available phosphorus	96
4. 2. 1. 6 Exchangeable K.....	99
4. 2. 2 Effects of land preparation on soil nutrient content.....	101
4. 2. 2. 1 Total Nitrogen	101
4. 2. 2. 2 Ammonium	102
4. 2. 2. 3 Nitrate	104
4. 2. 2. 4 Total phosphorus	107
4. 2. 2. 5 Available phosphorus.....	108
4. 2. 2. 6 Exchangeable potassium.....	110
4. 2. 3 Summary	111
Chapter 5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	113
5.1 Specific conclusions	114
5. 2 Recommendations for future work	114
REFERENCES	116-137

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Composition of sludge or effluent from a few selected waste source in New Zealand.....	7
Table 2.2	Estimated volume of waste produced on New Zealand farm	8
Table 2.3	Estimation of annual effluent production on an average sized of dairy farm in New Zealand.....	9
Table 2.4	Dry matter and nutrient contents of farmyard manure and slurry in the UK and USA.....	16
Table 2.5	Maize dry matter yield (tonnes ha ⁻¹) as affected by two tillage treatments.....	29
Table 2.6	Tillage system effects on residue cover, soil erosion, P and K losses with fall-applied P and K in the USA.....	41
Table 3.1	Nutrient content in liquid effluent at two times of application	48
Table 4.1	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on total N at two soil depths (g kg ⁻¹ soil).....	59
Table 4.2	Effects of method of effluent application on nitrogen	60
Table 4.3	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on ammonium at two soil depths (mg kg ⁻¹ soil)	
Table 4.4	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on nitrate at two soil depths (mg kg ⁻¹ soil).....	64
Table 4.5	Effects of tillage systems and effects of time lapse after effluent application on total phosphorus at two soil depths (g kg ⁻¹ soil).....	68
Table 4.6	Effects of methods of effluent application on phosphorus in permanent pasture.....	68
Table 4.7	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on Olsen P (mg kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths.....	69

Table 4.8	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on exchangeable K (mg kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths	72
Table 4.9	Tillage effects on total soil nitrogen.....	75
Table 4.10	Tillage method effects on soil total phosphorus	80
Table 4.11	Effects of tillage systems and effects of time lapse after effluent application on total N at two soil depths (g kg ⁻¹ soil).	87
Table 4.12	Effects of method of effluent application on nitrogen in soil...	87
Table 4.13	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on NH ₄ ⁺ (mg kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths.....	88
Table 4.14	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on nitrate (mg kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths.....	92
Table 4.15	Effects of tillage systems and effects of time lapse after effluent application on total phosphorus (g kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths	95
Table 4.15	Effects of method of effluent application on total phosphorus in soil (g kg ⁻¹ soil).....	96
Table 4.17	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on Olsen P (mg kg ⁻¹) at two soil depths	97
Table 4.18	Effects of tillage systems and time lapse after effluent application on exchangeable K (mg kg ⁻¹ soil) at two soil depths	98
Table 4.19	Tillage method effects on total nitrogen.....	102
Table 4.20	Tillage method effects on total phosphorus.	107

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig. 2.1	A schematic diagram of the process involved in acidification and nitrate leaching following nitrification of ammonium fertiliser	34
Fig. 2.2	The phosphorus cycle in a grazed pasture system.....	38
Fig. 3.1	Field experimental layout.....	44
Fig. 3.2	Massey University designed Inverted-T injector used in the experiments.....	46
Fig 3.3	Land preparation for the cultivated treatment for the second experiment.....	47
Fig 3.4	The field application of liquid effluent on the experimental plots.....	49
Fig. 3.5	Rectangular core used for sampling.....	51
Fig. 3.6	Field sample collection for soil nutrient measurement.....	53
Fig. 4.1	Effluent ponding visible on the surface of CT plots after application	57
Fig. 4. 2	Effects of method of effluent application on ammonium in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	62
Fig. 4. 3	Effects of method of effluent application on ammonium in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	62
Fig. 4.4	Effects of method of effluent application on ammonium in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	62
Fig. 4.5	Effects of methods of effluent application on nitrate in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	66
Fig. 4.6	Effects of methods of effluent application on nitrate on no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	66
Fig. 4.7	Effects of method of effluent application on nitrate in	

	conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	66
Fig. 4.8	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	71
Fig. 4.9	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	71
Fig. 4.10	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	71
Fig. 4.11	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05)	73
Fig. 4.12	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	73
Fig. 4.13	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05)	73
Fig. 4.14	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on ammonium (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05.....	77
Fig. 4.15	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on ammonium (10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05.....	77
Fig. 4.16	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on ammonium (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	77
Fig. 4.17	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on nitrate (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05.....	79
Fig. 4.18	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on nitrate content (10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05.....	79

Fig. 4.19	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on nitrate content (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	79
Fig. 4.20	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on Olsen P (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	82
Fig. 4.21	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on Olsen P (at 10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	82
Fig. 4.22	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on Olsen P (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	82
Fig. 4.23	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on exchangeable K content (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	83
Fig. 4.24	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on exchangeable K (10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$...	84
Fig. 4.25	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on exchangeable K (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	84
Fig. 4.26	Effects of methods of effluent application on ammonium in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	90
Fig. 4.27	Effects of methods of effluent application on ammonium in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	90
Fig. 4.28	Effects of methods of effluent application on ammonium in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	90

Fig. 4.29	Effects of methods of effluent application on nitrate in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	93
Fig. 4.30	Effects of method of effluent application on nitrate on no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	93
Fig. 4.31	Effects of methods of effluent application on nitrate in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	93
Fig. 4.32	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	98
Fig. 4.33	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	98
Fig. 4.34	Effects of methods of effluent application on Olsen P in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	98
Fig. 4.35	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in permanent pasture (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05)	100
Fig. 4.36	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in no-till (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	100
Fig. 4.37	Effects of methods of effluent application on exchangeable K in conventional tillage (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05)	100
Fig. 4.38	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on ammonium (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05.....	103
Fig. 4.39	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on ammonium (at 10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05...	104
Fig. 4.40	Interactions between the tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on ammonium (Vertical bars show LSD at P=0.05).....	104
Fig. 4.41	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent	

	application by injection method on nitrate (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	106
Fig. 4.42	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on nitrate (10cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	106
Fig. 4.43	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on nitrate content (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	107
Fig. 4.44	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on Olsen P (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	109
Fig. 4.45	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on Olsen P (10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	109
Fig. 4.46	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on Olsen P (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	109
Fig. 4.47	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on exchangeable K (at the centre of the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	110
Fig. 4.48	Interaction between tillage systems and effluent application by injection method on exchangeable K (10 cm away from the groove). Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$	110
Fig. 4.49	Interactions between tillage systems and effluent application by broadcast method on exchangeable K (Vertical bars show LSD at $P=0.05$).....	111