1



Agriculture and Food Development Authority

2	
3	
4	TITLE: Quantification of in situ denitrification rates in groundwater below an arable and a
5	grassland system
6	
7	AUTHORS: M.M.R. JAHANGIR, P. JOHNSTON, K. ADDY, M.I. KHALIL, P.M.
8	GROFFMAN, K.G. RICHARDS
9	
10	
11	
12	
	This article is provided by the author(s) and Teagasc T-Stór in accordance with publisher

policies.

Please cite the published version.

The correct citation is available in the T-Stór record for this article.

13

NOTICE: This is the author's version of a work that was accepted for publication in *Water, Air, & Soil Pollution*. Changes resulting from the publishing process may not be reflected in this document. Changes may have been made to this work since it was submitted for publication. A definitive version was subsequently published in *Water, Air and Soil Pollution*, 2013;224(9):1693. DOI 10.1007/s11270-013-1693-z. The The final publication is available at http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11270-013-1693-z.

14



This item is made available to you under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non commercial-No Derivatives 3.0 License.

1

6	٢	3	Ξ
	BY	NC	ND

17

16

18	Quantification of <i>in situ</i> denitrification rates in groundwater below an arable and a grassland
19	system
20	
21	M.M.R. JAHANGIR ^{1, 2,3} , P. JOHNSTON ² , K. ADDY ⁴ , M.I. KHALIL ⁵ , P.M. GROFFMAN ⁶ ,
22	K.G. RICHARDS ^{1, *}
23	
24	¹ Teagasc Environment Research Centre, Johnstown Castle, Co. Wexford, Ireland
25	² Department of Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering, Trinity College Dublin,
26	Ireland; ³ Department of Soil Science, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh-
27	2202; ⁴ Dept. of Natural Resources Science, University of Rhode Island, One Greenhouse
28	Road, Kingston, RI 02816, USA; ⁵ Environmental Protection Agency, Johnstown Castle
29	Estate, Ireland; ⁶ Cary Institute of Ecosystem Studies, P.O. Box AB, Millbrook, NY
30	12545, USA.
31	
32	
32 33	
32 33 34	
 32 33 34 35 26 	
32 33 34 35 36 37	* Correspondence: Teagasc Environment Research Centre
 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 	* Correspondence: Teagasc Environment Research Centre Johnstown Castle
 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 	* Correspondence: Teagasc Environment Research Centre Johnstown Castle Co. Wexford
 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 	* Correspondence: Teagasc Environment Research Centre Johnstown Castle Co. Wexford Ireland
 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 	* Correspondence: Teagasc Environment Research Centre Johnstown Castle Co. Wexford Ireland Tel: +353 (0) 53 9171200

43 Abstract

44 Understanding denitrification rates in groundwater ecosystems can help predict where agricultural reactive nitrogen (N) contributes to environmental degradation. In situ 45 46 groundwater denitrification rates were determined in subsoil, at the bedrock-interface and in bedrock at two sites, grassland and arable, using an in situ 'push-pull' method with ¹⁵N 47 48 labelled nitrate (NO₃⁻-N). Measured groundwater denitrification rates ranged from 1.3 to 469.5 μ g N kg⁻¹d⁻¹. Exceptionally high denitrification rates observed at the bedrock-interface 49 at grassland site $(470\pm152\mu g \text{ N kg}^{-1}\text{d}^{-1}; \text{ SE}, \text{ standard error})$ suggest that deep groundwater can 50 51 serve as substantial hotspots for NO_3 -N removal. However, denitrification rates at the other locations were low and may not substantially reduce NO₃-N delivery to surface waters. 52 53 Denitrification rates were negatively correlated with ambient dissolved oxygen (DO), redox potential (Eh), k_s and NO_3^- (all p-values p<0.01) and positively correlated with SO_4^{2-} 54 (p<0.05). Higher mean $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ ratios at arable (0.28) site than the grassland (0.10) 55 revealed that arable site has higher potential to indirect N₂O emissions. Identification of areas 56 57 with high and low denitrification and related site parameters can be a tool to manage 58 agricultural N to safeguard the environment.

59 Key words: Denitrification, ¹⁵N-enrichment, ¹⁵N-N₂O, ¹⁵N-N₂, groundwater, N₂O mole 60 fraction

61

62 **1. Introduction**

The nitrogen (N) cascade is an increasingly important global issue with multiple impacts on terrestrial, aquatic and atmospheric environments (Galloway et al., 2008). The high rates of N deposition result in N saturation in agricultural land causing high nitrate (NO_3^--N) delivery to groundwater which is of concern with result to global environment and human health (Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, 2009). In Ireland, groundwater beneath some agricultural systems is contaminated with NO₃⁻ and this also contributed to the eutrophication of estuarine and near coastal waters (McGarrigle et al., 2010). The OECD (2009) urged Ireland to strengthen measures to achieve "good ecological status" for Irish waters by 2015, paying special attention to eutrophication. The requirement for "good ecological status" for Irish waters is a requirement of the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD; EC, 2002).

74 The biogeochemical process, denitrification, is the principal process which converts the NO_3 -N to nitrous oxide (N₂O) and dinitrogen (N₂) gas (Rivett et al., 2008). The intermediate 75 product N₂O is a potent greenhouse gas with global warming potential 298 over a 100 year 76 77 time period. Indirect N₂O emissions resulting from N leaching into associated groundwater are an important but poorly understood component of global N₂O budget (Clough et al., 78 2007). The quantity of the end product of denitrification process, N₂, is by far the largest 79 80 uncertainty of the N cycle at all scales (Galloway et al., 2004). Therefore, narrowing this 81 uncertainty is critical if improvements are to be made in global N₂O and N₂ budgets. 82 Quantification of $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ ratios in groundwater would help refine greenhouse gas 83 inventories and provide insights into the relative contribution of denitrification to 84 environmentally benign N₂ production.

As denitrifiers are reported to be ubiquitous in shallow to deep groundwaters (Linne von Berg and Bothe, 1992; Francis et al., 1989) the availability of energy sources and suitability of the hydrogeological environments for denitrifiers need to be investigated. Barrett et al. (2013) quantified denitrification genes in four Irish aquifers (up to 50 m), including the two sites in the current study. They found similar concentrations of denitrification genes across sites and piezometer depth. Therefore optimum hydrogeochemical conditions for microbial

91 denitrification can help biodegradation of NO₃⁻N (ITRC, 2002). Analysis of dissolved N₂O 92 and N_2 in groundwaters from subsoil (5 m), bedrock-interface (12 m) and bedrock (22 m) in 93 Ireland underlined that denitrification can be an important NO₃⁻ removal pathway across 94 shallow to deep groundwaters (Jahangir et al., 2012a). However, in groundwater 95 denitrification studies it is often unclear if the denitrification products are produced *in situ* or if they have been leached from surface soils (Groffman et al., 1998). Application of in situ 96 97 remediation to any contaminant and site is gaining wide acceptance as viable and economic 98 technology (ITRC, 2002). However, the denitrification process in groundwater is very 99 difficult to measure, and existing methods used to measure denitrification are problematic for 100 a variety of reasons (e.g., high background N₂, degassing of samples and physical attenuation) 101 (Groffman et al., 2006). The in situ NO₃⁻ push-pull method has been used to determine 102 denitrification in shallow groundwater (<3 m) (Addy et al., 2002; Kellogg et al., 2005). Istok 103 et al. (1997) used the push-pull method for measuring groundwater denitrification in a sand 104 and gravel aquifer at a depth of approximately 10 m. However, in the deep groundwater zones 105 it can be more challenging due to the complex hydrogeological settings e.g., high 106 permeability or preferential flow through fracture in bedrock resulting in high physical 107 attenuation (Buss et al., 2005). In this study, the push-pull method was extended from shallow 108 to deep groundwaters (up to 22 m) to quantify denitrification rates. The objectives of this 109 study were to (a) assess application of the 'push-pull' method in deep groundwaters; (b) 110 determine *in situ* denitrification rates in shallow to deep groundwaters; (c) quantify the N₂O 111 mole fractions, $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$; and (d) identify factors controlling the observed spatial trends 112 of denitrification rates.

113

114 **2. Materials and Methods**

115 2.1 Experimental site characteristics

116 The *in situ* NO_3^- push-pull method was used at two groundwater monitoring sites in 117 Southeastern Ireland (Figure 1). The sites were: Johnstown Castle (52° 17' 30" N, 6° 29' 50" 118 W), a poorly drained intensively managed grazed (35 years) grassland, and Oak Park (52° 51' 119 43" N, 6° 54' 53" W), a well drained arable land with spring barley-cover crop rotation (10 years). Both sites receive approximately 312 and 150 kg N ha⁻¹ as organic and inorganic 120 forms of N, resulting in N surpluses of 243 and 75 kg N ha⁻¹, respectively. The grassland site 121 122 comprises poorly drained top soils overlying clayey subsoils inter-mixed with sands and 123 gravels followed by ordovician sediments, sandstone and shale at 10 m. At the arable site, soil 124 profile comprises well drained top soil overlying subsoils of sands, gravel and inter-bedded 125 clay band followed by grey limestone at 10 m (Figure 2). Three distinct water tables were 126 encountered on each of the sites and these were specifically targeted with piezometers (Figure 127 2). The aquifer beneath the grassland site is poorly productive, with a shallow perched water 128 table but has had elevated NO₃-N concentrations reported (Fenton et al., 2009). At the arable 129 site there had a productive sand and gravel aquifer overlying a productive limestone aquifer, 130 both of which were vulnerable to NO_3 -N pollution as previously described by Premrov et al. 131 (2012). The hydrologic and geochemical properties of the sites were presented in Table 1. The grass and arable sites represent approximately 62 and 37% of Irish soil types and 21 and 71% 132 133 of bedrock types, respectively.

134

135 2.2 *In situ* Push-Pull Method

We adapted the *in situ* push–pull method of Addy et al. (2002) and Kellogg et al. (2005) to estimate denitrification rates in shallow (5 m bgl, below ground level) to deep (12-22 m bgl) groundwaters. Groundwater wells (PVC with 0.05 m i. d.; 2 m screen section) were placed along groundwater flow paths at three depths to target samples in (S) subsoil (5 m bgl),
(I) bedrock-interface (12 m bgl) and (B) bedrock (22 m bgl). The push-pull method comprised
two steps: (1) the push-pull pre-test and (2) the NO₃⁻ push-pull test. The study (pre-test and
NO₃⁻ push-pull test) was conducted during October -December 2010.

143

144 2.4 *In Situ* Push-Pull Pre-test

145 In Situ Push-Pull Pre-test was conducted to gain insights into balancing high recovery of 146 the plume with sufficient time *in situ* for microbial denitrification to occur at detectable 147 levels. Twenty litres of groundwater was collected from each well, amended with a 148 conservative tracer bromide (Br; 20 mg L^{-1}) and pushed into the same well (at least one well 149 per depth per site) using a peristaltic pump (Model 410, Solinst Canada Ltd.). The dosing 150 solution amended with Br was sampled during the push phase to obtain the undiluted 151 concentration of Br. The push-pull pre-test was conducted repeatedly with initial incubation 152 for a 12-h period and then lowered to 3-h with the estimation of corresponding recoveries of 153 Br. An incubation period less than 3-h was not attempted because of the concern that there 154 would be low detection of denitrification gases in the subsequent NO_3^{-1} push-pull test, 155 particularly in deep bedrock. After the incubation period groundwater (twice the dosing 156 volume), pulled up using a Grundfos pump (Model MP1, Grundfos, Fresno, CA, USA) taking 157 samples at 2 L intervals, was analysed for the Br⁻ recovery at each sample intervals. A 158 peristaltic pump was not used to pump water because of its inability to pump water from 159 depths greater than 6 m bgl. Groundwater injection and pumping back were conducted slowly 160 to prevent changes in hydraulic gradient around the well. After 1 week, groundwater in the 161 pre-tested wells was resampled and analyzed for Br⁻ to ensure that tracer concentration was at ambient level before conducting another pre-test with a shorter incubation period or before conducting the in situ NO_3^- push-pull test.

The injected volume of water was sufficient to fill approximately 270 to 1000 kg of aquifer materials (bulk density= 1650 - 2500 kg m⁻³, porosity = 0.03 - 0.12) after correcting for the sand and gravel pack around the well. The total amount of aquifer materials covered by the solution was calculated using the Eqn.1 below:

168
$$Mt = \left[\frac{(Vt - Vg)}{Porosity of aquifer}\right]^* Bd$$
(Eqn. 1)

where Mt is the total mass of aquifer materials (kg), Vt is the total volume of solution (m^3) , Vg is the volume of gravel pack (m^3) , and Bd is the bulk density (kg m⁻³).

171

172 2.5 In Situ ¹⁵N-NO₃⁻ Push–Pull Experiment

173 In situ NO₃⁻ push-pull tests were conducted in S, I and B with three replications per depth. 174 Twenty liters groundwater was collected in a carboy from each well and stored in a cold room at 4° C for maximum 2 days. To adjust the dissolved oxygen (DO) back to ambient 175 176 conditions, groundwater solution was bubbled with sulphur hexafluoride (SF₆; 98.2%, 177 Cryoservice Ltd., Worcester WR4 9RH, UK) while the DO concentration was monitored using a DO probe (Multi 340i/SET, WTW, Germany). The SF₆ can also serve as a 178 conservative tracer. The dosing solution was prepared with ambient groundwater, 20 mg L⁻¹ 179 Br⁻ as KBr and 20 mg N L⁻¹ as isotopically enriched KNO₃ (50 atom% ¹⁵N-KNO₃; purity 180 181 99%). The carboy with dosing solution was capped and its headspace was filled with the SF_6 gas. The SF₆ headspace was maintained with same pressure while connected to a SF₆ gas 182 183 cylinder (carried to field) during the injection of the dosing solution. The dosing solution was injected into the respective well over the course of 1- 2-h (depending on the permeability, 184 185 Table 1; and hydraulic gradient, data not shown) with a peristaltic pump with a Teflon outlet 186 at a very low rate (10 to 15 L h^{-1}). Samples were collected for DO, SF₆, Br⁻ and other 187 dissolved gases and hydrochemistry during the middle of the injection phase.

188 The incubation period was defined as the length of time between the end of the push phase 189 and the start of the pull phase since the plume core would consist mostly of the later injected 190 groundwater. The incubation period for the dosing solution was set at 6-h, based on pre-test 191 results so that there was substantial plume recovery and sufficient incubation time. After the incubation period, groundwater was pumped back from the well slowly (10 to 15 L h⁻¹) using 192 193 a Grundfos pump with a Teflon outlet. As the injected volume was pumped, such samples 194 were taken using a syringe attached to an air-tight sampling apparatus made of stainless steel 195 tubing connected to the outlet of the Grundfos pump. Groundwater samples (120 ml) were 196 injected into an evacuated serum bottle (160 ml) and the headspace (40 ml) was filled with 197 high-purity helium gas (*He*: water ratio = 1: 3; v/v), and then submerged under water in a 198 polystyrene box and stored at 4°C. For each well, conservative tracers (Br and SF_6) 199 recoveries were estimated as C/Co; where C was the tracer's concentrations in the pulled 200 groundwater following incubation and Co was the tracer's concentrations in the original 201 pushed groundwater (Freeze and Cherry, 1979).

202

203 2.6 Dissolved Gas Analysis

Groundwater dissolved gases (N_2O , N_2 and SF_6) in ambient, pushed, and pulled samples were extracted using the phase equilibration headspace extraction technique, with *He* filling the headspace (Lemon, 1981; Davidson and Firestone, 1988) in the lab on the same day of sample collection. Groundwater samples collected in the serum bottles were shaken for 5 min on a Gyrotory shaker (Model G-10, New Bruns- wick Scientific Co., USA) and left for a standing period of 30 min. Headspace samples were then taken for the analysis of SF₆, N₂O

and N₂ concentrations and the ¹⁵N enrichment of N₂O and N₂ in 12 ml exetainers (Labco Inc. 210 Wycomb, UK) after injecting additional 12 ml high purity He. The N₂O and SF₆ gases were 211 212 analysed on a gas chromatograph (CP-3800 GC, Varian, Inc. USA/CTC Analytics combi PAL Auto Sampler, Switzerland) equipped with an electron capture detector (ECD) using Ar 213 as a carrier gas. The GC had a Porapak-Q column (80-100 MESH), 3.7 m x 1/8" x 2.0 mm. 214 Concentrations and ¹⁵N enrichment of N₂O and N₂ were determined on a dual-inlet isotope 215 ratio mass spectrometer (Stable Isotope Facility, UC Davis, Davis, CA) as described by 216 217 Mosier and Schimel (1993).

218

219 2.7 Calculations of Denitrification Rate

220 Dissolved N₂O and N₂ concentrations were calculated using the three highest recovery 221 values within sample replicates (Harrison et al., 2011). The masses of dissolved N₂O–N and 222 N_2 gases (µg) were calculated from the headspace extraction samples using equations and constants provided by Tiedje (1982) and Mosier and Klemedtsson (1994). The total mass of 223 N_2O-N or N_2 was then transformed to the mass of ${}^{15}N_2O-N$ or ${}^{15}N_2$ by multiplying it by the 224 respective ¹⁵N sample enrichment proportion (ratio of pulled atom % of the dissolved N₂O-N 225 226 and N_2 to pushed NO_3^- –N atom %, both corrected for ambient atom %). Gas production rates for ${}^{15}N_2O-N$ and ${}^{15}N_2-N$ were expressed as $\mu g N kg^{-1}$ soil d⁻¹ as below: 227

228 Rates
$$\mu$$
g Nkg⁻¹d⁻¹= $\frac{Total mass of {}^{15}N_{2}O - N and {}^{15}N_{2} - N pervolume of water pulled}{Drymass of soil pervolume of water * incubation period pulled}$ (Eqn. 2)

229 Mass of aquifer materials was calculated for individual depths at each site. Total 230 denitrification rates were the sum of ${}^{15}N_2O-N$ and ${}^{15}N_2$ generation rates. All samples used in 231 denitrification calculations contained at least 8 mg L⁻¹ NO₃⁻ –N to ensure that calculated 232 denitrification rate estimates were not limited by the amount of NO₃⁻-N available (Schipper 233 and Vojvodic-Vukovic, 1998). 234 2.8 Hydrological and geochemical analyses

235 Groundwater permeability (k_s) was estimated using the slug test method (Bouwer and 236 Rice, 1976) with 20 seconds for the initial linear point to eliminate the drainage in the gravel 237 pack. Groundwater table (GWT) depth was measured using an electrical dip meter. Samples 238 for DO were collected in a 12 ml exetainer (Labco Ltd, Wycombe, UK), after slowly overflowing approximately 10 ml excess water and closed immediately using double septum 239 240 (butyl rubber + Teflon) stopper. Samples were submerged under water in a polystyrene box, 241 stored at 4°C and analysed within one week. DO was measured by membrane inlet mass 242 spectrometry (MIMS) (Kana et al., 1994). Groundwater pH, electrical conductivity (EC) and 243 redox-potential (Eh) were measured using a multiparameter probe (Troll 19500, In Situ Inc. 244 USA). Groundwater was analysed for NO₃-N and Br on DX-120 ion chromatography 245 (Metrohm UK Ltd.). The DOC was analysed using Total Organic Carbon Analyser (TOC-V 246 cph/cpn; Shimadzu Corporation, Kyoto, Japan). Groundwater non-metallic ions e. g. total oxidised N, nitrite, NH_4^+ and P; reduced metals e.g. Fe^{2+} , Mn^{2+} and S^{2-} were analyzed with an 247 Aquakem 600 Discrete Analyser (Aquakem 600A, Vantaa, Finland). Groundwater SO₄²⁻ 248 concentration was measured with a turbimetric method (Askew and Smith, 2005). 249

250

251 2.9 Statistical Analyses

The measured denitrification rates were approximately log-normally distributed. Therefore, non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis H tests were performed to determine significant differences in groundwater denitrification rates among depths within each site. After significant differences were observed among depths, Mann–Whitney U tests (Ott, 1993) were performed as a post hoc test to determine which depths were significantly different. Paired t tests (Ott, 1993) were performed to determine significant differences in recovery (C/Co) between Br⁻ and SF₆. Spearman rank order correlations were performed to determine significant correlations between groundwater denitrification rates and ambient DO, Eh, NO_3^- N, DOC and k_s. All statistical analyses were performed on GenStat (2011). All statistical differences were considered significant at p<0.05 level.

262

3. Results

264 3.1 Groundwater physico-chemical properties

265 Groundwater ambient physico-chemical properties related to denitrification differed among sites (Table 1). Mean NO₃-N concentrations were significantly different between sites 266 267 (p<0.001). Considering the within site differences among various depths, NO₃⁻-N concentrations were significantly higher (p<0.01) in S than at the I and B at grassland site but 268 were similar at a able site. Mean NH_4^+ concentrations were low at both sites, with being 0.14 269 and 0.02 mg L⁻¹ at grassland and arable sites, respectively. Groundwater pH was near neutral 270 271 in all depths at grassland but was higher at I compared with B at the arable site. Reduced Fe 272 (Fe II) concentrations were higher at grassland than that at arable site (Table 1). Mean groundwater SO_4^{2-} concentrations were significantly higher at a able site than the grassland 273 (p<0.05) but were similar between depths at each site. Mean S²⁻ concentrations were similar 274 275 across sites and depths. Mean DO concentrations were significantly lower at the grassland site 276 than at arable site (Table 1). Mean DOC concentrations were significantly higher at grassland $(2.6\pm0.8 \text{ mg L}^{-1})$, than at the arable site $(0.9\pm0.1 \text{ mg L}^{-1})$ (p<0.05). Interestingly, DOC was 277 278 similar between depths at each site, whereas DO significantly decreased (p < 0.05) with depth 279 at both sites (Table 1). The C/N ratios were significantly higher at grassland than the arable 280 site (data not shown). Irrespective of depths, C/N ratios ranged 1.2 - 20.5 and 0.10 - 0.14 at grassland and arable sites, respectively. Phosphorous (orthophosphate, PO_4^{3-}) concentrations 281

were below the detection limit in groundwater at both these study sites (<0.005 mg L⁻¹). The Eh at grassland (25-94 mV) site were lower compared with the arable site (107-178 mV) (Table 1). The arable site had a higher aquifer saturated hydraulic conductivity coupled with a deeper groundwater table than at the grassland (Table 1). Saturated hydraulic conductivity (k_s) increased with the increase in groundwater depth (Table 1).

287

288 3.2 Assessment of push-pull method for deep groundwaters

The predetermined k_s value in each piezometer (mean 0.009 m d⁻¹ \pm 0.002 (standard error, 289 SE) at grassland; mean 0.049 m $d^{-1} \pm 0.008$ at arable) provided an insight into the potential 290 291 incubation times for push-pull pre-test. However, push-pull pre-test at both sites revealed a 292 significant influence of incubation time on the recovery of tracer (Br) injected into the 293 piezometer (p<0.001). Reducing the incubation time increased tracer recovery from 9-30% 294 for the 12-h incubation to 30-80% for the 3-h incubation. In the NO₃⁻ push-pull test, the 295 percentage recovery of the two tracers used (Br and SF_6) were similar (p>0.05) to each other. 296 Mean recovery of the Br⁻ and SF₆ tracers did not differ significantly among groundwater 297 depths within each site but differed between the two sites. Mean Br recoveries in the core 298 plume (the first 2-4 L of the pull where recovery is the highest) after a 6-h incubation ranged from 43% in B to 59% in S at grassland and 39% in B to 55% in S at the arable site. 299

300

301 3.3 *In-situ* denitrification rates

302 Over the short incubation period (6-h), NO_3^- removal via denitrification was detected at 303 both sites. Denitrification rates at grassland site (mean = 163 µg N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±153 (SE) were 304 significantly higher than that at the arable site (mean = 3.9 µg N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±2.0). Among depths 305 within the grassland site (Figure 3a), significantly higher denitrification rates were measured

at I (mean = 470 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±111); than S (mean =10.9 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±3.5) or B (mean = 9.2 306 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±2.8). Similarly denitrification rates in the three different depths at the arable site 307 were significantly higher (p<0.05) at I (6.4 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±1.8) than S (3.8 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±0.7) 308 or B (1.4 μ g N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹±0.4) (Figure 3b). Mean denitrification rates were equivalent to a 309 weighted average of 3.92 and 0.09 mg NO₃⁻N L^{-1} d⁻¹, respectively at the grassland and arable 310 311 sites, which accounted for 24.5 and 0.33% of the N input to the land. Denitrification rates individually in the S, I and B at grassland were equivalent to 0.2, 10.3 and 0.3 mg N $L^{-1} d^{-1}$ 312 313 which accounted for 1, 65 and 2% of the N input, respectively. The coefficient of variations 314 (CV) for denitrification rates between wells was 55, 115 and 109% in the S, I and B, 315 respectively at the grassland and 117, 60 and 47% in S, I and B at the arable site.

316

317 3.4 N₂O mole fraction

The N₂O/(N₂O+ N₂) ratios were significantly higher at the arable site (mean = 0.28 ± 0.04) than at the grassland site (mean = 0.10 ± 0.02) (Figure 4). Among the three depths, N₂O/(N₂O+ N₂) ratios were significantly higher in S and I than B at arable site. In contrast, they were lower in S than I and B at the grassland (Figure 4a, 4b). In situ production of environmentally benign N₂ was the dominant end product of denitrification and ranged from 89-93% of the total denitrification gases at the grassland site, whereas at the arable site it ranged from 62-85% of the total denitrification gases.

325

326 3.5 Relationships between denitrification rates and ambient hydrogeochemical conditions 327 Spearman Rank Order correlation between denitrification rates and ambient geochemical 328 properties showed significantly negative correlations between denitrification rates and 329 ambient DO (r = -0.52, p<0.05), Eh (r = -0.52, p<0.05), NO₃⁻-N concentrations (r = -0.69, 330 p<0.01), and saturated hydraulic conductivity (r = -0.50, p<0.05). There was no significant 331 correlation observed between denitrification rates and ambient DOC concentrations in 332 groundwater. In addition, denitrification rates showed a positive correlation with reduced Fe 333 (Fe II; r=0.39; p<0.05), SO_4^{2-} (r=0.32; p<0.05) and NH_4^+ (r=0.33; p<0.05). A conceptual 334 model showing site hydrogeochemistry, groundwater denitrification and NO_3^- -N pollution 335 potential was presented in Figure 5.

336

4. Discussion

4.1 Assessment of push-pull method for deep groundwaters

339 Estimation of tracer recovery is very important for quantifying groundwater denitrification 340 rates and to understand the decline in concentrations of denitrification end products by 341 physical processes like advection, dispersion and diffusion. Both Br and SF₆, being used in these sites, had similar rates of recovery in the NO_3^- push pull test and indicated that there was 342 343 no degassing loss of SF₆ during the incubation and sampling. The similarities in the recovery 344 of both tracers also enhance the confidence of estimating groundwater dissolved gas 345 concentrations produced via denitrification during the incubation period. Bromide has been 346 used as a tracer because in groundwater, it does not come in to contact with vegetation, thus 347 uptake by plant is minimized (Richards et al., 2005). However, either of the tracers can be 348 used for investigating groundwater denitrification using the push-pull test. Only Br has been used as the conservative tracer in many riparian groundwater NO₃⁻ studies (Simmons et al., 349 350 1992; Nelson et al., 1995; Starr et al., 1996) and other in situ riparian studies (Addy et al., 351 2002; Clough et al., 2007; Kellogg et al., 2005) have used both Br⁻ and SF₆ as conservative 352 tracers.

353 Recovery rates in this study (5-22 m bgl) were relatively lower than the push-pull studies by Addy et al. (2002) and Kellogg et al. (2005). Both studies incubated the dosing solutions 354 355 for variable times e.g., 4 to 24-h (Kellogg et al., 2005) and 5 to 72-h (Addy et al., 2002). Their higher tracer recoveries were found at shallower depths i.e. in 0.65 to 1.25 m and 0.65 to 3 m 356 357 that provided a maximum recovery of 80 and 70%, respectively. Our tracer recoveries were 358 within the range found by Harrison et al. (2011); 42-54% recovery in summer and 20-26% in 359 winter in two alluvial wetlands with minipiezometer to a depth of 0.5 m and incubated for 4-360 h. Low tracer recovery in our study is likely due to high advective dispersion and diffusion 361 and low residence time in these aquifers which have sediments with larger and more connected secondary pores or preferential flow path via fracture/fissure (Buss et al., 2005; 362 Misstear et al., 2009). Sedimentary rocks e.g., Ordovician sediments, sandstones in the 363 364 grassland site and limestones at the arable sites showed increased hydraulic conductivity with depth of aquifers. Solute movement follows piston flow model in subsoil but in bedrock it 365 366 follows complex pattern of movement because bedrock might have both vertical and 367 horizontal flow paths via fractures developed by glacial movement.

368

369 4.2 Variations in groundwater denitrification rates

Denitrification rates were highest at I of the grassland site, higher than observed in the S. Our lower denitrification rates were within the range of shallow groundwater denitrification rates reported by Kellogg et al. (2005) (<1 to 330 ug N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹), Addy et al. (2002) (2.1 to 123.2 ug N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹) and Harrison et al. (2011) (<0.1 to 193 ug N kg⁻¹ d⁻¹), but our grassland I high value was higher than reported by these other *in situ* push-pull papers. Higher denitrification rates at I (10 m bgl) are in line with the findings of Weymann et al. (2010) 376 who, from a laboratory incubation experiment, observed that NO_3^- removal in the autotrophic

377 zone (6.5 to 7.0 m bgl) is much more intensive than shallow zone (1.5 to 4.0 m bgl).

378 Our results suggest that while denitrification is not ubiquitous in deep groundwaters, it can 379 serve as substantial hotspots for groundwater N removal before its delivery to surface waters. 380 Higher denitrification rates at the I indicate that denitrification is not limited to shallow 381 groundwater, rather it can occur in deep groundwaters. This notion is in contrast to the 382 assumption of Van Drecht et al. (2003) who developed an empirical model with an 383 assumption that denitrification is zero in deep groundwater. However, underestimation of 384 denitrification rates may also occur because NO₂⁻ and NO production rates are not included in 385 the calculation (Bollmann and Conrad, 1997; Harrison et al., 2011; Istok et al., 1997).

Denitrification rates showed high spatial variability because groundwater hydrogeological 386 387 properties that control denitrification are heterogeneous. The coefficients of variation of N_2O 388 concentrations between wells within each site, ranged from 55-115 and 47-60% at grassland 389 and arable sites, respectively, and were similar to the coefficients of variation of N₂O 390 production found by other workers, in surface soils e.g., 71-139% (Mathieu et al., 2006), 78-391 122% (Jahangir et al., 2011), 14-132% (Ishizuka et al., 2005) and in shallow groundwater 392 e.g., 219% (Von der Heide et al., 2008). This variation indicates that denitrification is likely 393 to be an active process, as it is in top soil, of natural NO_3^- reduction in shallow to deep 394 groundwaters. Moreover, high spatial variability of N₂O production is consistent with the high 395 spatial variability of groundwater DO (CV 120%), Eh (CV 219%) and DOC (CV 98%), 396 suggesting that NO_3^- in groundwater is being processed and these properties can be the key 397 indicators of groundwater denitrification. The in situ push-pull tests were only conducted 398 during one season because dissolved N₂O and N₂ at the sites were previously observed to be 399 similar throughout the year (Jahangir et al., 2012a).

401 Higher N₂O mole fractions at the arable site than that at the grassland might have occurred 402 due to low N₂O reduction rates at this site, because high DO at this site might have reduced 403 N₂O reduction and thus increased its accumulation. Mean N₂O mole fractions in the *in situ* 404 measurements were comparable with those measured in a laboratory incubation of subsoil 405 from the grassland site with values of 0.25 to 0.42 in 0 - 10 cm; 0.06 to 0.36 in 45 - 55 cm and 406 0.04 to 0.24 in 120 - 130 cm depths (Jahangir et al., 2012b). The N₂O mole fraction in this 407 study (0.07-0.38) was comparable with Harrison et al. (2011) who measured $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ 408 ratios of 0.02- 0.21 in 0.5 m bgl in alluvial wetlands using the *in situ* push-pull method. Mean 409 N_2O mole fraction, calculated at each site, implies two possibilities: 1) the groundwater could 410 be an important source of atmospheric N₂O when it discharges to surface streams and rivers 411 (Deurer et al., 2008) or diffused upwardly from water table to the atmosphere (Ueda et al., 412 1993); or 2) N₂O can further be reduced to N₂ (Weymann et al., 2008). Mean mole fractions 413 0.02 at grassland to 0.09 at the arable site from monthly measurements over two years (2009-414 2010) in these wells (Jahangir et al., 2012a) were lower than that of the measurements by in 415 situ push-pull test, possibly because N₂O might have been further reduced to N₂ while passing 416 through and from the sediments to the streams due to its longer residence times. However, 417 another possible reason for higher $N_2O/(N_2O+N_2)$ ratios in the *in situ* study than that of the 418 monitoring results of Jahangir et al. (2012a) could be the addition of $NO_3^{-}N$ to groundwater 419 by at least 2 times of the ambient concentration, as high NO₃⁻-N concentration can accelerate 420 N_2O production (Scholefield et al., 1997; Blackmer and Bremner, 1978), inhibit N_2O 421 reduction (Simek and Cooper, 2002) and eventually increase the N₂O mole fraction. The monitoring results suggest that denitrification is more complete, resulting in lower N₂O mole 422

fractions, taking into consideration the travel time through aquifers which can take frommonths to years at these sites (Fenton et al, 2011).

425

426 4.4 Relationships between denitrification and ambient hydrogeochemical conditions

427 The differences in denitrification rates between sites and depths may be explained by their 428 contrasting hydrologic and geochemical conditions (Table 1). The ITRC (2002) highlighted 429 that in situ hydrologic (e.g., groundwater table, k_s and hydraulic gradient), geochemistry (e.g., 430 Eh, Fe II, DO and TOC) and microorganisms are important factors for bioremediation. The 431 lower k_s at grassland site favoured denitrification. In comparable study Fenton et al. (2009) 432 found that subsoil k_s was negatively related to groundwater N_2/Ar ratio. Fenton et al. (2009) 433 measured saturated hydraulic conductivity in 17 wells in subsoil at grassland site by slug 434 which ranged from 0.001 to 0.016 m d⁻¹. These hydraulic conductivity values were 435 comparable with the range of present study. Fitzsimons and Misstear (2006) reported the hydraulic conductivity values of some low to moderate permeable tills in Ireland ranging 436 from 0.0004 to 0.009 m d^{-1} which was within the range of the current study at the grassland 437 438 site. The DO, being comparable in all depths at the grassland site, was lower than the arable 439 site. The low DO and low Eh indicate the higher anaerobiocity of groundwater that could 440 foster denitrification. Rivett et al. (2008) identified DO and electron donor concentrations and 441 availability as the primary factors governing denitrification in groundwater. Böhlke et al. (2007) observed <1.6 mg L^{-1} of DO was required for complete denitrification of NO₃⁻-N to 442 N₂. The higher DO and Eh at the arable site suggests that *in situ* denitrification may be either 443 very low or zero under these conditions. The observed denitrification rates, though small at 444 445 the arable site, could be attributed to either deriving from aerobic denitrification (Robertson et al., 1995) or through denitrification occurring in anaerobic microsites (Seitzinger et al., 2006). 446

From groundwater monitoring results of hydrochemistry and dissolved gases (N₂O and excess N₂, called denitrified N₂), higher NO₃⁻-N and lower N₂O and N₂ concentrations were previously observed at the arable site (Jahangir et al., 2012a) supporting this theory. On the same sites Barrett et al. (2013) observed nir and nosZ abundance (these are the functional genes associated with nitrite and nitrous oxide reductase) of $13.5 - 4.6 \times 10^3$ and $9.8 - 18.3 \times 10^2$ (gene copy conc. L⁻¹), indicating that microbial occurrence is unlikely to be a limiting factor for groundwater denitrification.

454 DOC enhances denitrification by reducing DO through aerobic respiration, releasing CO_2 455 and as an electron donor for denitrifier community. Moreover, DOC was available to shallow 456 groundwater and also the deep groundwater as there was no significant decline in DOC with 457 depth from 5 to 22 m bgl. The lack of any significant correlation between DOC and denitrification rates may be due to the high spatial variabilities in DOC concentration (<1 to 458 $>10 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$). In deep groundwaters, however, other electron donors, such as Fe minerals, can 459 460 be of importance as denitrification rates showed positive correlation with reduced Fe, which 461 was the highest at the I at grassland site. The oxidation of sulphide compounds (bound with 462 Fe) under anaerobic conditions may release Fe (II) or Mn (Kolle et al., 1985). Negative correlations between denitrification and ambient NO3⁻ concentration implies that low ambient 463 NO₃⁻ existed in groundwater wells due to occurrence of natural denitrification process that 464 465 substantially reduced NO₃⁻ (Konrad, 2007; Vogel et al., 1981; Weymann et al., 2008). In denitrification process, if reduced S is the electron donor, SO_4^{2-} is formed (Rivett et al., 2008). 466 The positive correlation between groundwater SO_4^{2-} and denitrification rates might be 467 contributed to oxidation of sulphur in anaerobic environment where S^{2-} (reduced S or metal 468 bound S) might be an important electron donor (autotrophic denitrification). The NH₄⁺, being 469 observed mainly at grassland, showed positive correlation with denitrification rates because 470

471 NH_4^+ generation via dissimilatory nitrate reduction to ammonium (DNRA) might have 472 occurred in the anaerobic environment which is a requirement for denitrification.

473

474 **Conclusions**

475 The results of this study show that the push-pull method for groundwater denitrification rates using ¹⁵N-enriched NO₃⁻N can be used in the deep groundwater systems. Low 476 477 conservative tracer recovery may have underestimated denitrification estimates. The bedrock-478 interface at the grassland site with low DO, Eh and high DOC demonstrates that deep 479 groundwater can serve as a 'hot spot' for NO_3^- removal. Even where we observed low denitrification rates at the arable site with high DO, Eh and low DOC, its contribution to 480 481 indirect N₂O emissions should still be accounted for in global N₂O budgets. The strong 482 correlations between denitrification rates and hydrogeologic conditions suggest that 483 modelling within geographical information systems may help to predict locations with 484 substantial subsurface denitrification rates. These findings show important implications about 485 the natural NO₃-N attenuation capacity of groundwater beneath intensively managed 486 grassland that reduces the risk of NO₃-N delivery to the surface waters. In addition, N₂O 487 mole fractions from in situ measurements indicated that groundwater denitrification can reduce indirect N₂O emissions to the atmosphere. Therefore, NO_3^- -N reduction to N₂O and to 488 489 N₂, while transported through groundwater to the receptors are simultaneous processes which 490 balance net NO_3^- -N delivery to surface waters and indirect N_2O emissions to atmosphere.

491

492 Acknowledgements

The study was funded by the Department of Agriculture and Food, Ireland through theResearch Stimulus Fund Programme (Grant RSF 06383) in collaboration with the Dept. of

495	Civil, Structural and Environmental Engineering, The University of Dublin, Trinity College.
496	The authors sincerely acknowledge the contribution of Mr. John Murphy for in field work.

497

Addy, K., Kellogg, D.Q., Gold, A.J., Groffman, P.M., Ferendo, G., & Sawyer, C. (2002). In
situ push-pull method to determine groundwater denitrification in riparian zones. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 31, 1017-1024.

Aquakem 600A (Konelab 60). (2006). Aquakem Reference Manual. Thermo Electron OY,
Clinical Diagnostics, Clinical Chemistry and Automation Systems, Ratasie 2, Vantaa,
Finland.

Askew, F.E., & Smith, R.K. (2005). Inorganic non-metallic constituents, 4500-SO₄²⁻;
Sulphate; Method 4500-SO₄²⁻ E. Turbimetric method. In: Eaton, et al., (Eds.), Standard
Methods for the Examination of Waters and Waste Water, 21st ed. American Public
Health Association, NW Washington, DC, pp. 4–188. ISBN 0-87553-047-8 (2001-3710).

Barrett, M., Jahangir, M.M.R., Lee, C., Smith, Cindy J., Bhreathnach, N., Collins, G.,
Richards, Karl G., & O'Flaherty, V. (2013). Abundance of denitrification genes under
different piezometer depths in four Irish agricultural groundwater sites. Environmental
Science & Pollution Research, 20, 6646-6657.

513 Blackmer, A.M., & Bremner, J.M. (1978). Inhibitory effect of nitrate on reduction of nitrous
514 oxide to molecular nitrogen by microorganisms. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 10, 187515 191.

- 516 Böhlke, J.K., Verstraeten, I.M., & Kraemer, T.F. (2007). Effects of surface-water irrigation on
- 517 sources, fluxes, and residence times of water, nitrate, and uranium in an alluvial aquifer.

518 Applied Geochemistry, 22, 152-174.

- 519 Bollmann, A., & Conrad, R. (1997). Acetylene blockage technique leads to underestimation
- 520 of denitrification rates in oxic soils due to scavenging of intermediate nitric oxide. *Soil*
- 521 *Biology and Biochemistry*, 1997; 29: 1067-1077.
- Bouwer, H., & Rice, R.C. (1976). A slug test for determining hydraulic conductivity of
 unconfined aquifers with completely or partially penetrating wells. *Water Resources Research*, 12, 423-428.
- Buss, S.R., Rivett, A.R., Morgan, P., & Bemment, C.D. (2005). Attenuation of nitrate in the
 subsurface environment. *Environment Agency Report*, EPA, UK.
- 527 Clough, T.J., Addy, K., Kellogg, D.Q., Nowicki, B.L., Gold, A.J., & Groffman, P.M. (2007).
 528 Dynamics of nitrous oxide in groundwater at the aquatic–terrestrial interface. *Global*529 *Change Biology*, 13, 1528–1537.
- 530 Davidson, E.A., & Firestone, R.K. (1988). Measurement of nitrous oxide dissolved in soil
 531 solution. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 52, 1201-1203.
- 532 Deurer, M., Von der Heide, C., Bottcher, J., Duijnisveld, W.H.M., Weymann, D., & Well, R.
- 533 (2008). The dynamic of N_2O near the groundwater table and the transfer of N_2O into the
- unsaturated zone: A case study from a sandy aquifer in Germany. *Cataena*, 72, 362-373.
- EC (2002). Council Directive (2000/60/EEC) of the 23rd October 2000 on establishing a
 framework for Community action in the field of water policy. Official Journal of the
 European Communities L327/1, Brussels, Belgium.

538	Fenton, O.,	Richards, K.G	., Khalil	l, N	И.I., &	e Healy	7, M	I.G. (20	09). Facto	ors affecti	ng nitrate	in :
539	shallow	groundwater	under	a	beef	farm	in	South	Eastern	Ireland.	Journal	of
540	Environ	mental Manage	ement, 9	0(10), 31	35-31	46.					

- Fenton, O., Schulte, R.P.O., Jordan, P., Lalor, S.T.J., & Richards, K.G. (2011). Time lag: a
 methodology for the estimation of vertical and horizontal travel and flushing timescales to
 nitrate threshold concentrations in Irish aquifers. *Environmental Science and Policy*,
 14(4), 419-431.
- Fitzsimon, V.P., Misstear, B.D.R., 2006. Estimating groundwater recharge through tills: a
 sensitivity analysis of soil moisture budgets and till properties in Ireland. Hydrogeology
 Journal, 14, 548-561.
- 548 Francis, A.J., Slater, J.M., & Dodge, C.J. (1998). Denitrification in deep sub-surface
 549 sediments. *Geomicrobiology Journal*, 7, 103-106.
- 550 Freeze, R.A., & Cherry, J.A. (1979). Ground Water. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New
 551 Jersy.
- 552 Galloway, J.N., Townsend, A.R., Erisman, J.W., Bekunda, M., Cai, Z.C., Freney, J.R.,
- Martinelli, L.A., Seitzinger, S.P., & Sutton, M.A. (2008). Transformation of the N cycle:
 recent trends, questions and potential solutions. *Science* 320, 889-892.
- 555 Galloway, J.N., Dentener, F.J., Capone, D.G., Boyer, E.W., Howarth, R.W., Seitzinger, S.P.,
- 556 Asner, G.P., Cleveland, C.C., Green, P.A., Holland, E.A., Karl, D.M., Michaels, A.F.,
- 557 Porter, J.H., Townsend, A.R., & Vorosmarty, C.J. (2004). Nitrogen cycles: past, present
- and future. *Biogeochemistry*, 70, 153-226.
- 559 GenStat. Version 13.1, VSN International Ltd. 2011; UK.

- Groffman, P.M., Gold, A.J., & Jacinthe, P.A. (1998). Nitrous oxide production in riparian
 zones and groundwater. *Nutrient Cycling Agroecosystems*, 52, 179-186.
- 562 Groffman, P.M., Altabet, M.A., Böhlke, J.K., Butterbach-Bahl, K., David, M.B., Firestone,
- M.K., Giblin, A.E., Kana, T.M., Nielsen, L.P., & Voytek, M.A. (2006). Methods for
 measuring denitrification: Diverse approaches to a difficult problem. *Ecological Applications*, 16, 2091–2122.
- Harrison, M.D., Groffman, P.M., Mayer, P.M., Kaushal, S.S., & Newcomer, T.A. (2011).
 Denitrification in Alluvial Wetlands in an Urban Landscape. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 40, 634-646.
- Ishizuka, S., Iswandi, A., Nakajima, Y., Yonemura, S., Sudo, S., Tsuruta, H., & Muriyarso, D.
 (2005). Spatial patterns of greenhouse gas emission in a tropical rainforest in Indonesia. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*, 71, 55-62.
- 572 Interstate Technology and Regulatory Council (2002). A systematic approach to in situ
 573 bioremediation in groundwater. Technical/Regulatory Guidelines, August 2002, USA.
- Istok, J.D., Humphrey, M.D., Schroth, M.H., Hyman, M.R., & O'Reilly, K.T. (1997). SingleWell, "Push-Pull" Test for In Situ Determination of Microbial Activities. *Ground Water*35, 619–631.
- Jahangir, M.M.R., Roobroeck, D., Van Cleemput, O., & Boeckx, P. (2011). Spatial variability
 and biophysicochemical controls on N₂O emissions from differently tilled arable soils.
 Biology and Fertility of Soils, 47(7), 753-766.
- 580 Jahangir, M.M.R., Khalil, M.I, Johnston, P.M., Cardenas, L., Butler, M., Hatch, D., Barrett,
- 581 M.M., O'Flaherty, V., & Richards, K.G. (2012b). Denitrification potential in subsoils: a

- 582 mechanism to reduce nitrate leaching to groundwater. *Agriculture Ecosystems &*583 *Environment*, 147, 13-23.
- Jahangir, M.M.R., Johnston, P.M., Barrett, M., Khalil, M.I., Fenton, O., Boeckx, P.,
 Groffman, P., & Richards, K.G. (2012a). Denitrification and indirect N₂O emissions from
 groundwater: Hydrologic and biogeochemical influences. *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology*, 152, 70-81.
- Kana, T.M., Darkangelo, C., Hunt, M.D., Oldham, J.B., Bennett, G.E., & Cornwell, J.C.
 (1994). Membrane inlet mass spectrometer for rapid high precision determination N₂, O₂
 and Ar in environmental water samples. *Analytical Chemistry*, 66, 4166-4170.
- Kellogg, D.Q., Gold, A.J., Groffman, P.M., Addy, K., Stolt, M.H., & Blazejewski, G. (2005).
 In situ groundwater denitrification in stratified, permeable soils underlying riparian
 wetlands. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 34, 524-533.
- Kolle, W., Strebel, O., & Bottcher, J. (1985). Formation of sulphate by microbial
 denitrification in a reducing aquifer. *Water Supply*, 3, 35-40.
- Konrad, C. (2007). Methoden zur Bestimmung des Umsatzes von Stickstoff, dargestellt fur
 drei pleistozane Groundwasserleiter Nord-deutschlands, PhD thesis, Dresden University
 Of Technology, Germany, p. 157.
- Lemon, E. (1981). Nitrous oxide in freshwaters of the Great Lakes basins. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 26, 867-879.
- 601 Linne von Berg, K.H., & Bothe, H. (1992). The distribution of denitrifying bacteria in soil
- 602 monitored by DNA-probing. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*, 86, 331-340.

603	Mathieu, O., Leveque, J., Heault, C., Milloux, M.J., Bizouard, F., & Andreux, F. (2006).
604	Emissions and spatial variability of N_2O , N_2 and nitrous oxide mole fraction at the field
605	scale, revealed with ¹⁵ N isotopic techniques. Soil Biology and Biochemistry, 38, 941-951.
606	McGarrigle, M., Lucey, J., & Ó'Cinnéde, M. (2010). Water Quality in Ireland 2007-2009.
607	Synthesis Report, Environmental protection Agency, Wexford, Ireland.
608	Misstear, B.D.R., Brown, L., & Johnston, P.M. (2009). Estimation of groundwater recharge in
609	a major sand and gravel aquifer in Ireland using multiple approaches. Hydrogeology
610	Journal, 17, 693-706.
611	Mosier, A.R., & Schimel, D.S. (1993). Nitrification and Denitrification. In: Knowles, R., and
612	T.H. Blackburn. (Ed.). Nitrogen isotope techniques. Academic Press, 1993; Orlando, FL.

- 613 pp. 181-208.
- Mosier, A.R., & Klemedtsson, L. (1994). Measuring denitrification in the field. In: Weaver et
 al. (Ed.). Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2, SSSA Book Ser 5, SSSA, 1994; Madison,
 USA. pp. 1047-1065.
- Nelson, W.M., Gold, A.J., & Groffman, P.M. (1995). Spatial and temporal variation in
 groundwater nitrate removal in a riparian forest. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 24,
 691-699.
- Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). OECD Environmental
 Performance Reviews of Ireland, Conclusions and Recommendations. 4 November
 2009, p. 2-18.
- 623 Ott, R.L. (1993). An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis. 4th Ed. Duxbury
 624 Press, Belmont, CA.

- Premrov A., Coxon C.E., Hackett R., Kirwan L., & Richards K.G. (2012). Effects of overwinter green cover on groundwater nitrate and dissolved organic carbon concentrations
 beneath tillage land, *Science of the Total Environment*, 438, 144–153.
- Richards, K., Coxon, C.E., & Ryan, M. (2005). Unsaturated zone travel time to groundwater
 on a vulnerable site. *Irish Geography*, 38, 57-71.
- Rivett, M.O., Buss, S.R., Morgan, P., Smith, J.S.N., & Bemment, C.D. (2008). Nitrate
 attenuation in groundwater: A review of biogeochemical controlling processes. *Water Research*, 42, 4215-4232.
- Robertson, L.A., Dalsgaard, T., Revsbech, N.P., & Kuenen, J. (1995). Confirmation of
 'aerobic denitrification' in batch cultures, using gas chromatography and ¹⁵N mass
 spectrometry. *FEMS Microbiol Ecology*, 18, 113–120.
- 636 Schipper, L., & Vojvodic-Vukovic, M. (1998). Nitrate removal from groundwater using a
 637 denitrification wall amended with sawdust: Field trial. *Journal of Environmental Quality*,
 638 27, 664-668.
- 639 Scholefield, D., Hawkins, J.M.B., & Jackson, S.M. (1997). Use of flowing helium atmosphere
 640 incubation technique to measure the effects of denitrification controls applied to intact
 641 cores of a clay soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 29, 1337-1344.
- 642 Seitzinger, S., Harrison, J.A., Böhlke, J.K., Bouwman, A.F., Lowrance, R., Peterson, B.,
- Tobias, C., & Van Drecht, G. (2006). Denitrification across landscape and waterscape: A
 synthesis. *Ecological Application*, 16, 2064–2090.
- Simek, M., Cooper, J.E. (2002). The influence of soil pH on denitrification: Process towards
 the understanding of this interaction over the last 50 years. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 53, 345-354.

- 648 Simmons, R.C., Gold, A.J., & Groffman, P.M. (1992). Nitrate dynamics in riparian forests:
 649 Groundwater studies. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 21, 656-665.
- Starr, J.L., Sadeghi, A.M., Parkin, T.B., & Meisinger, J.J. (1996). (1996). A tracer test to
 determine the fate of nitrate in shallow groundwater. *Journal of Environmental Quality*,
 25, 917-923.
- Tiedje, J.M. (1982). Denitrification. p. 1011-1025. In: Page et al. (Ed.). Methods of soil
 analysis. Part 2, 2nd Ed. Agron. Monogr. ASA and SSSA, Madison, WI.
- Ueda, S., Ogura, N., Yoshinary, T. (1993). Accumulation of nitrous oxide in aerobic
 groundwaters. *Water Research*, 27, 1787-1792.
- Van Drecht, G., Bouwman, A.F., Knoop, J.M., Beusen, A.H.W., Meinardi, C.R. (2003).
 Global modelling of the fate of nitrogen from point and non-point sources in soils,
 groundwater, and surface water. *Global Biogeochemical Cycles*, 17(4), 1115.
 doi:10.1029/2003GB002060
- Vogel, J.C., Talma, A.S., & Heaton, T.H.E. (1981). Gaseous nitrogen as evidence for
 denitrification in groundwater. *Journal of Hydrology*, 50(1–3), 191–200.

Von der Heide, C., Böttcher, J., Deurer, M., Weymann, D., Well, R., & Duijnisveld, W.H.M.

664 (2008). Spatial variability of N₂O concentrations and of denitrification-related factors in
665 the surficial groundwater of a catchment in Northern Germany. *Journal of Hydrology*,
666 360, 230-241.

663

Weymann, D, Geistlinger H, Well R, Von der Heide C, & Flessa H. (2010). Kinetics of N₂O
 production and reduction in a nitrate-contaminated aquifer inferred from laboratory
 incubation experiments. *Biogeosciences*, 7: 1953-1972.

670	Weym	ann, D.,	Well, R	R., Flessa, H., vo	n der Heid	e, C.,	Deure	r, M., Meyer, K	., Konrad, C., &
671	W	alther, W	7. (2008). Groundwater	N ₂ O emiss	sion fa	actors	of nitrate-contai	minated aquifers
672	as	derived	from	denitrification	progress	and	N_2O	accumulation.	Biogeosciences
673	Di	scussion,	5, 1215	5-1226.					
674									
6/5									
676									
677									
678									
679									
680									
681									
					30				

Table 1 Ambient hydrologic and hydrochemical properties; values are means \pm SE, n=3

$\begin{array}{c} \mbox{(m V)} \mbox{(m, bgl)} (m, $	m d ⁻¹) .008±0.002a .024±0.004a
and il $4.7\pm1.6a$ $1.0\pm0.1a$ $12\pm4a$ $20.0\pm1.6a$ $0.26\pm0.04a$ $1.9\pm0.1a$ $6.9\pm0.1a$ $94\pm28a$ $1.8\pm0.1a$ 0.00 gl acce $2.0\pm1.8b$ $3.5\pm2.3a$ $48\pm27b$ $19.2\pm1.6a$ $0.21\pm0.06a$ $1.3\pm0.4b$ $6.8\pm0.1a$ $25\pm62b$ $2.9\pm0.9b$ 0.02 ogl	.008±0.002a
il $4.7\pm1.6a$ $1.0\pm0.1a$ $12\pm4a$ $20.0\pm1.6a$ $0.26\pm0.04a$ $1.9\pm0.1a$ $6.9\pm0.1a$ $94\pm28a$ $1.8\pm0.1a$ 0.00 gl acce $2.0\pm1.8b$ $3.5\pm2.3a$ $48\pm27b$ $19.2\pm1.6a$ $0.21\pm0.06a$ $1.3\pm0.4b$ $6.8\pm0.1a$ $25\pm62b$ $2.9\pm0.9b$ 0.02 ogl	.008±0.002a
gl ace 2.0±1.8b 3.5±2.3a 48±27b 19.2±1.6a 0.21±0.06a 1.3±0.4b 6.8±0.1a 25±62b 2.9±0.9b 0.02 ogl	.024±0.004a
ace 2.0±1.8b 3.5±2.3a 48±27b 19.2±1.6a 0.21±0.06a 1.3±0.4b 6.8±0.1a 25±62b 2.9±0.9b 0.02 ogl	.024±0.004a
ogl	
ck $2.9\pm1.3b$ $3.4\pm2.7a$ $14\pm13a$ $16.4\pm1.6a$ $0.24\pm0.04a$ $1.6\pm0.1b$ $6.8\pm0.1a$ $47\pm43b$ $3.4\pm1.0b$ 0.03	.030±0.005a
ogl	
e land	
il 12.8 \pm 2.6a 1.1 \pm 0.2a 4.4 \pm 1.1a 27.2 \pm 1.0a 0.17 \pm 0.01a 9.5 \pm 1.4a 7.8 \pm 1.3b 178 \pm 60a 4.2 \pm 0.2a 0.03	.033±0.006a
$10.4 \pm 0.3a 0.8 \pm 0.2a 4.8 \pm 0.7a 23.3 \pm 1.1a 0.24 \pm 0.08a 6.2 \pm 1.6b 8.9 \pm 1.2a 163 \pm 50a 4.6 \pm 0.1a 0.05a 10.4 \pm 0.3a 10.4 \pm 0.3a $.053±0.003a
ogl	
ck 12.6 \pm 2.5a 0.7 \pm 0.2a 2.7 \pm 1.0a 27.3 \pm 0.7a 0.18 \pm 0.05a 4.1 \pm 1.4b 7.5 \pm 0.1b 107 \pm 39b 5.1 \pm 0.1a 0.12	.123±0.003b
Dgl	

692

List of Figures

Figure 1 Experimental sites and multilevel well locations; grassland at Johnstown Castle
and arable land at Oak Park in South-Eastern Ireland. Receptors are carrying groundwater to

the nearby rivers (river 'Kildavin' at grassland and river 'Barrow' at arable land).

- 696 *Figure 2* Borehole installation cross sections from sites: Johnstown castle (JC) and Oak
- 697 Park (OP) with average water table and Ks values. Wells installation depths, geochemical
- properties, details of water table depths and Ks values were summarised in Table 1

Figure 3 Mean denitrification rates (N_2O+N_2) in (a), three different depths of groundwater

- 700 at grassland (n=3) and (b), at arable land (n=3)
- 701 Figure 4 Mean N₂O mole fraction, N₂O/(N₂O+N₂) in (a), three different depths of
- 702 groundwater at grassland (n=3) and (b), at a able land (n=3)
- Figure 5 A conceptual model showing site hydrogeochemistry vs. denitrification and nitrate (NO₃⁻-N) pollution potential
- 705
- 706
- 707
- 708

709

- 710
- 711
- 712
- 713
- 714
- 715