United States
Department of
Agriculture

**Soil
Conservation
Service**

Agricultural
Waste Management
Field Handbook

# Chapter 11 Waste Utilization

(210-AWMFH, 4/92)

# Chapter 11 Waste Utilization

Contents:


**651.1100 Introduction 11–1**

**651.1101 Waste consistency 11–2**
(a) Solid ... 11–2
(b) Semi-solid ... 11–2
(c) Slurry ... 11–2
(d) Liquid ... 11–4

**651.1102 Land application 11–4**
(a) The conservation plan ... 11–4
(b) Benefits of recycling ... 11–4
(c) Application methods ... 11–5
(d) Application management ... 11–10

**651.1103 Salinity 11–11**

**651.1104 Plant nutrients 11–14**
(a) Nitrogen ... 11–14
(b) Phosphorus ... 11–15
(c) Potassium ... 11–15

**651.1105 Nutrient management 11–16**
(a) Nutrient losses ... 11–17
(b) Nutrient mineralization ... 11–20
(c) Nutrient requirements ... 11–22
(d) Nutrient accounting ... 11–23
(e) Accounting procedure ... 11–23
(f) Adjustments for site characteristics ... 11–32
(g) Rule-of-thumb estimates ... 11–33

**651.1106 References 11–36**

## Tables


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Table 11–1** | Friction loss ratio, slurries vs. clean water | 11–6 |
| **Table 11–2** | Maximum application rate (in/hr) | 11–6 |
| **Table 11–3** | Reduction coefficients by percent solids | 11–7 |
| **Table 11–4** | Total salts and electrical conductivity for various waste material (Stewart 1975) | 11–12 |
| **Table 11–5** | Percent of original nutrient content of manure retained by various management systems | 11–18 |
| **Table 11–6** | Percentage of nitrogen of that in the applied manure still potentially available to the soil | 11–19 |
| **Table 11–7** | An estimate of inorganic nitrogen losses to leaching related to the soil Leaching Index | 11–20 |
| **Table 11–8** | Approximate manure— N denitrification estimates for various soils | 11–21 |
| **Table 11–9** | General mineralization rates for nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium | 11–22 |
| **Table 11–10** | Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from dairy cows by management system | 11–33 |
| **Table 11–11** | Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from feeder swine by management system | 11–34 |
| **Table 11–12** | Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from broilers and layers by management system | 11–34 |
| **Table 11–13** | Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from feeder beef by management system | 11–35 |

## Figures


| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Figure 11–1** | Relative handling characteristics of different types of manure and percent total solids | 11–2 |
| **Figure 11–2** | Gallons of water required per cubic foot of material for dilution to pumping consistency | 11–3 |
| **Figure 11–3** | Acre inches pumped in given time at various pumping rates | 11–9 |
| **Figure 11–4** | Removal time for various cycle times and spreader capacities | 11–10 |
| **Figure 11–5** | Waste storage pond dilution factors for re sulting low salinity on coarse textured soils | 11–12 |
| **Figure 11–6** | Waste storage pond dilution factors for resulting low salinity on medium textured soils | 11–12 |
| **Figure 11–7** | Waste storage pond dilution factors for resulting low salinity on fine textured soils | 11–13 |
| **Figure 11–8** | Maximum annual amount of undiluted waste storage pond water that can be added to a coarse (C), medium (M), or fine textured (F) soil | 11–13 |
| **Figure 11–9** | Distribution of nutrients between feces and urine | 11–14 |
| **Figure 11–10** | Example of a water budget for winter wheat | 11–17 |
| **Figure 11–11** | Nitrogen transformation in the accounting procedure | 11–24 |

# Chapter 11 Waste Utilization

## 651.1100 Introduction

Water and air quality protection requires proper management of organic waste from agricultural operations. Recycling of agricultural waste materials by land application for plant uptake and crop production is a traditional and proven waste utilization technique. Properly done, recycling by land application and crop uptake is an environmentally sound method of waste management.

The primary purpose of this chapter is to give information on utilization of livestock and poultry manure. It describes methods for applying animal waste to land and lists cautions and restrictions for specific methods. Other methods are discussed, but not presented.

Other waste utilization methods include handling products of solids separation and composting, biogas generation, and wetlands creation. Solids from solids separation operations can be used for bedding for livestock; they can be mixed with grains and other materials and re-fed to cattle; and they can be dried, bagged, and sold on the retail market. Liquids from the solids separation operation must be accounted for in waste management operations.

Waste materials can be used for biogas generation. The gas can be used for powering electricity generating equipment, the electricity from which can be either used onfarm or sold to a local utility. The gas can also be used directly to run heating equipment for some livestock, such as farrowing houses or pig nurseries, and for poultry operations, such as egg laying operations. The volume of waste material and the content of elements do not diminish significantly through the biogas generation process.

Composting of organic materials to reduce their reactivity or to stabilize the material is a viable waste management component. The agricultural producer must have the necessary skills and equipment to manage composting operations, and there must be a need for or use of the composted material. Waste that needs to be managed using composting techniques include dead bird carcasses (poultry) because an environmentally safe utilization alternative is not available and such highly unstable nitrogenous material as livestock manure because adequate land is not available or the crop nutrient needs are insufficient. Sale of composted materials as nursery rooting materials or on the retail market makes composting a viable waste utilization component.

Use of constructed wetlands falls peripherally under the utilization topic in terms of providing a nutrient source for aquatic vegetation associated with the wetlands. The primary function of wetlands used in waste management systems is treatment. Effluent from wetlands should be monitored to assure that state water quality standards are being met. Influent quality of wastewater being supplied to the wetlands should be checked to assure that nutrient strength is not excessive for the aquatic vegetation involved.

Agricultural land is also the recipient of many other wastes, such as municipal wastewater and sludge, food processing waste, and waste classified as hazardous under the Resource Construction and Recovery Act. These other wastes have widely varying characteristics requiring special design considerations that are not treated in this handbook.

Utilization of waste agrichemicals is not in the scope of this chapter. The chapter on pesticide management describes how to properly manage and dispose of waste agrichemicals (to be added).

Other than those where the waste products are used by offsite sources, waste treatment options described above have a resultant waste material that must be used on the farm. The option available to the farm owner/operator ultimately comes down to land application for recycling purposes. Consequently, this chapter's primary function is to provide information on utilization of animal manure and wastewater applied on agricultural land for crop production and environmental protection.

As a review of information presented in chapter 9, consistency of the waste controls how the waste is handled. Total solids (TS) content in the waste controls consistency. Wastes are classified in four categories according to their consistency—solid, semi-solid, slurry, and liquid. As the moisture content varies, the handling characteristics vary. Chapter 4 gives the moisture content of manure (feces and urine) as excreted; however, changes in consistency as moisture

is added or removed must be taken into account in planning a waste management system. The consistency of manure when it is applied to the land affects the type of equipment used and the amount applied.

**Figure 11–1** Relative handling characteristics of different types of manure and percent total solids (ASAE 1990)




## 651.1101 Waste consistency

Ruminants tend to produce a manure that is in the semi-solid range when excreted; swine excrete a slurry manure; and poultry excrete a manure that is classified as a solid. This clearly points out the need to be knowledgeable of waste consistency in terms of total solids to properly select waste management system components.

### (a) Solid

Waste with a high percent total solids—called solid waste—is produced by a wide variety of agricultural, municipal, and industrial operations. Animal-feeding operations, particularly feedlots, yield large quantities of solid organic wastes that can be applied to land. Manure that is more than about 20 percent solids (fig. 11–1) can be handled as a solid. A mixture of manure, bedding (straw or wood chips), and feed waste is generally a solid. It is transported by box/open spreaders or dump trucks to the land for application.

### (b) Semi-solid

Semi-solid waste has a somewhat firm consistency. With reference to figure 11-1, total solids content of semi-solid animal manure can range from 10 to about 22 percent, depending on the animal species. Semi-solid manure generally can be transported and spread using the same box/open spreaders and dump trucks used for solid manure.

### (c) Slurry

Slurry generally is associated with confined feeding operations for cattle and swine. The feces and urine as excreted behave as a slurry rather than as a solid or a liquid. The solids content of slurry ranges from about 5 to 15 percent except as noted below. In this range, manure has fluid handling characteristics, but requires special pumping equipment. It can be transported by either tank wagon or pump and pipeline. Pump and pipeline are more economical for transporting large

volumes of slurry because of the time and labor requirements for tank wagons. Slurry can be applied to the land by sprinklers that have a large nozzle, by broadcasting from slurry tanks, or by injection under the ground surface. Because of its propensity to cause odors and pollute water, slurry should be incorporated immediately into the soil profile.

If slurry material from confined livestock facilities is properly agitated, it generally flows readily to a pump inlet. It may have a solids content of as much as 10 or 15 percent for swine and cattle manure and 20 percent for some poultry manure. The more viscous materials are pumped into tank wagons by high-capacity, low-head pumps or are drawn in by vacuum pumps. On occasion, additional water is required for easier agitation and pumping.

Swine and poultry manure with about 12 percent solids and cattle manure with about 7 percent solids can be handled by certain types of large bore irrigation equipment. Large gun-type sprinklers must be powered by relatively low-capacity, high-head pumps that have chopping blades.

Swine or poultry manure diluted to less than 7 percent solids and cattle manure diluted to less than 4 percent solids can be applied by most irrigation equipment if the manure is free of fibrous material. Standard centrifugal pumps, regular sprinkler nozzles, or gated pipes can be used. If the material is distributed in graded furrows, the tail water should be recovered to prevent the runoff from polluting the surface water.

Figure 11–2 can be used to determine the amount of water needed to dilute manure for a specific pumping consistency. For example, assume that cattle manure that is 20 percent solids must be diluted for use with a standard irrigation sprinkler. The desired solids content is 4 percent. According to information in figure 11–2, roughly 30 gallons of water are needed per cubic foot of manure.

**Figure 11–2** Gallons of water required per cubic foot of material for dilution to pumping consistency



Figure 11–2 is based on the equation:

$$G = \frac{7.48\left(P_o - P_d\right)}{P_d}$$

where:

$G$ = Gallons of water required to be added to mixture per cubic foot of manure
$P_o$ = Original percent of solids in the mixture
$P_d$ = Desired percent of solids in the mixture

Important characteristics of different manure during storage in slurry form include:

- Poultry manure is heavy and dense and generally stratifies with a liquid layer forming on top.
- Swine manure tends to remain in suspension. Solids separation using short-term settling is difficult.
- The solids in cattle manure generally rise to the top and form a crust. This is particularly true if long hay or silage is fed to the cattle or if bedding is collected with the manure.

### (d) Liquid

Liquid waste has solids content of 5 percent or less. This consistency generally is produced where manure is diluted by wash water, flushing water, rainfall or runoff, or snowmelt. A common example is the liquid in a waste storage pond used to store runoff from a feedlot or outside dairy housing. Liquids also result from food processing operations and from municipal wastewater treatment.

Liquid waste can be handled by any type of sprinkler system or by such flood irrigation methods as furrows or borders. Waste application systems can often be combined with surface irrigation. Manure solids distribution, hence nutrients, may be uneven if flood irrigation methods are used because solids tend to settle out near the turnout.

If adequate water is available for irrigation, the system can be designed for maximum use of the manure for crop fertilization while meeting the consumptive use requirements; for example, the water needs of the crop. A screen must be installed in the system for removal of long fibers, hair, and other debris before irrigation begins.

## 651.1102 Land application

This section describes how manure can be applied to land to furnish nutrients for crops without degrading the environment.

### (a) The conservation plan

Land application of agricultural waste for crop production requires careful planning. Conservation plans developed for animal-feeding operations should include a plan for agricultural waste management needs and must address the overall nutrient management requirements for the farm or ranch operation. Chapter 2 gives details of the planning considerations. The goal should be to recycle nutrients in the waste material as fertilizer in amounts that can be used by the crop and will not degrade the environment.

The nutrients in the animal waste to be land applied must be accounted for in the nutrient management plan for the farming operation. Realistic crop yield goals must be established that recognize soil limitations and provide a fertility program that balances the nutrient application among all sources—manure, organic residue, soil minerals, commercial fertilizer, irrigation water, and nitrogen fixing plants.

### (b) Benefits of recycling

The most obvious benefit of recycling manure to the land is the fertilizer value. The return of the nutrients saves:

- Money otherwise spent for commercial fertilizer
- Natural resources
- Energy required to produce chemical fertilizers

The supply of easily mined phosphate for fertilizer is declining and needs to be conserved. More than 500 billion cubic feet of natural gas are used annually to produce ammonia nitrogen for fertilizer (Nelson 1975).

Other onfarm benefits result from land application of manure. Manure adds organic matter to the soil, which improves soil structure, infiltration, and tilth. Soil

erosion is controlled, and the moisture holding capacity is increased. Many farmers report that the fields on which manure has been applied always seem more loose and moist. Another benefit is that phosphorus and the organic part of the nitrogen are released slowly from the manure by the action of micro-organisms. This conserves these elements and makes them available to crops throughout the growing season. A disadvantage is that the nutrient release rate generally cannot be controlled.

Off-farm benefits also accrue. Properly applying manure reduces the potential of overenrichment of lakes and streams and also decreases the possibility of ground water contamination.

## (c) Application methods

The land application method should be based on the type and consistency of waste available, management of the confined animal operation (including waste management system), physical features of the farm, operator preferences, and availability of labor. No one correct method of waste application is always the right one to use. Generally, several alternatives are available. For the purpose of this discussion, waste application methods are categorized into two groups—pumped and hauled. The travel distances and application rates achievable with the application equipment must be addressed in preparing nutrient management plans and planning waste management systems.

Whether hauled or pumped, applied waste should be incorporated into the soil as soon as possible to preserve nutrient value and reduce the opportunity for runoff or odor complaints. Sections 651.0304 and 651.0802(b) provide guidance on management to minimize problems where wastes are applied on pasture.

### (1) Pumped application methods

Pumped application methods require either a liquid or slurry waste material, a delivery system of pump and conveyance, and suitable application equipment, such as large gun-type sprinklers, manure guns, or gated pipe. Gravity-fed conveyance systems can be substituted for pumps where the specific operation provides the elevation differential required for operation.

Because pumped irrigation application applies waste at a much faster rate than hauling, special consideration must be given to soil characteristics as follows (Horsfield 1973):

- Soils that have very low internal drainage and a very slow intake rate result in runoff and ponding, which means a greater chance for unequal infiltration and potential stream pollution.
- A sloping terrain at the application site makes it increasingly important that waste application rates are less than soil intake rates to ensure no runoff to watercourses.
- A high water table means that nutrients produced from waste decay have to move only short distances to contaminate the ground water. Shallow or sandy soils that have little filtering capacity increase the potential for a problem.
- Excessively drained, low yield-potential soils are a problem because crops remove less of the applied nutrients and irrigation water moves through the soil too rapidly for adequate assimilation.

The design of a pumped application system is site specific. The local irrigation specialist and irrigation guides should be consulted where available. If the pumped system is to be used for both application and the irrigation water supply, special care should be taken to size the system to meet the water consumption requirements of the crop.

***(i) Sprinkler systems***—Sprinkler systems are widely used to apply liquid manure and agricultural wastewater. The type of irrigation system depends upon the consistency of the manure and wastewater. Particle size of the solids contained in the manure and wastewater also affects the applicability of the particular type of irrigation system.

Liquid consistency of the waste can be assured by the addition of dilution water (fig. 11–2), removal of solids, or both. With proper screening, waste materials that meet the liquid consistency test can be applied with any type sprinkler system. Pump intake screens should be sized with openings no larger than the smallest sprinkler orifice.

Slurry can be applied using special pumping equipment and sprinklers that have a large nozzle or manure guns that have a flexible nozzle. Wastes containing trash, abrasives, bedding, or stringy material are not suitable for most sprinklers unless preconditioned by chopping or grinding.

***(ii) Pipelines***—Pipe friction losses for water that has solids are higher than those for clean water. The velocity in pipes should be less than 5 feet per second (fps), with a minimum of 2 fps to prevent sedimentation. Table 11–1 gives the relative increase in friction loss for slurries as compared to clean water for asphalt-dipped cast-iron pipe that is 6 to 10 inches in diameter. Although friction ratios will be slightly higher for smoother pipe materials at high velocities, the ratios below are satisfactory for most design conditions using PVC. Head losses in valves and fittings because of the turbulence should be approximately equal to those for clean water.

**Example 11–1:**
An 8-inch pipeline (PVC, IPS, SDR = 32.5, C = 150) is to deliver 550 gpm of slurry containing 10 percent solids. The friction loss for clean water is 0.19 psi/100 ft., and the velocity is 3.42 fps. From table 11–1, the factor (ratio) for slurry vs. clean water is 2.5 at 3.5 fps with 10 percent solids. The friction loss for the slurry would be calculated as:

$$\frac{0.19 \text{ psi}}{100 \text{ ft}} \times 2.5 = \frac{0.48 \text{ psi}}{100 \text{ ft}}$$

Although pipe friction losses might be higher for wastewater than for clean water, friction losses generally are a small percentage of the total power requirement in a sprinkler system. When the same pump is used for pumping both slurries and clean water, the pump might operate at different points on the pump curve for the two liquids. The effects when pumping slurries are a marked increase in brake horsepower requirements, a reduction in head produced, and some reduction in capacity. The increased horsepower requirement is caused by the higher fluid viscosity and is necessary to overcome the velocity head loss and the pipe friction losses. To account for the differences associated with presence of solids and higher viscosity, it is satisfactory to increase the power unit rating by 10 percent as a rule of thumb for situations where friction loss ratio exceeds 1.0.

**Table 11–1** Friction loss ratio, slurries vs. clean water (pipe, 6" to 10" diameter)

| Velocity fps | Percent solids 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 5.3 |
| 1.5 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 4.0 |
| 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.6 | 1.9 | 3.3 |
| 2.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 2.9 |
| 3.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 2.7 |
| 3.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.5 |
| 4.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.4 |
| 4.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.3 |
| 5.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.2 |
| 5.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.1 |
| 6.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| 6.5 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| 7.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |

Source: Adapted from Colt Industries Hydraulic Handbook, figure 44, Fairbanks Morse Pump Div., 11th Ed.

**Table 11–2** Maximum application rate (in/hr)

| Soil texture | Application amount in inches 0.25 | 0.5 | 0.75 | 1.0 | 1.25 | 1.5 | 2.0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sand | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 | 6.00 |
| Loamy sand | 6.00 | 6.00 | 4.83 | 4.22 | 3.86 | 3.62 | 3.32 |
| Sandy loam | 4.91 | 2.97 | 2.32 | 1.99 | 1.80 | 1.67 | 1.51 |
| Loam | 3.11 | 1.69 | 1.21 | 0.98 | 0.84 | 0.74 | 0.62 |
| Silt loam | 2.70 | 1.45 | 1.03 | 0.82 | 0.70 | 0.61 | 0.51 |
| Sandy clay loam | 1.74 | 0.96 | 0.69 | 0.56 | 0.48 | 0.43 | 0.37 |
| Clay loam | 1.27 | 0.68 | 0.48 | 0.39 | 0.33 | 0.29 | 0.24 |
| Silty clay loam | 1.09 | 0.57 | 0.40 | 0.32 | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.19 |
| Sandy clay | 0.61 | 0.33 | 0.23 | 0.19 | 0.16 | 0.14 | 0.12 |
| Silty clay | 0.84 | 0.44 | 0.30 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.14 |
| Clay | 0.39 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.07 |

**Note:** This table is for infiltration rate for full cover conditions and initial moisture content at 50 percent of the available water capacity. Field capacity of sand through sandy loam is assumed to be at 1/10 bar.

***(iii) Application rates and amounts***—For total solids content of 0.5 percent or less, sprinkler application rates should be consistent with the local irrigation guide recommendations, with no adjustment. If no local irrigation guide data are available, application rates in table 11–2 (based on soil texture) can be used for irrigation system design and management to help avoid ponding and runoff.

For total solids content in the wastewater of 0.5 percent or greater, application rates from the irrigation guide or table 11–2 should be reduced according to the information in table 11–3. The reduction coefficients in table 11–3 are based solely on decreases in hydraulic conductivity because of a layer of manure that forms on the soil surface during irrigation and has a lower hydraulic conductivity than the soil. Further reductions may be necessary in some situations, such as applications of wastewater with salt concentrations sufficient to disperse clay aggregates. Salt content of the wastewater should be determined to assess its effect of the intake rates of the soil where it will be applied.

**Example 11–2:**
The land user wants to apply 1 inch of wastewater with a 5 percent solids content on a loam soil. What is the allowable application rate in inches per hour?

**Table 11–3** Reduction coefficients by percent solids

| Soil texture | Percent solids (by wt) 0.5 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 3.0 | 5.0 | 7.0 | 10.0 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sand | 0.88 | 0.55 | 0.31 | 0.22 | 0.13 | 0.10 | 0.07 |
| Loamy sand | 0.70 | 0.54 | 0.37 | 0.28 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.10 |
| Sandy loam | 0.87 | 0.77 | 0.63 | 0.53 | 0.40 | 0.32 | 0.25 |
| Loam | 0.97 | 0.93 | 0.88 | 0.83 | 0.74 | 0.67 | 0.59 |
| Silt loam | 0.98 | 0.95 | 0.91 | 0.87 | 0.81 | 0.75 | 0.68 |
| Sandy clay loam | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.83 | 0.78 |
| Clay loam | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.94 | 0.92 | 0.89 |
| Silty clay loam | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.96 |
| Sandy clay | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| Silty clay | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Clay | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

Maximum application rate from table 11–2 is 0.98 inch per hour. The reduction coefficient from table 11–3 is 0.74. The allowable application rate is:

$$0.98 \times 0.74 = 0.73 \text{ in/hr}$$

**Example 11–3:**
A land user wants to apply wastewater with a 5 percent solids content on a silt loam soil that has dense vegetation. The estimated surface storage is 0.2 inches, before any runoff would occur. The land user would like to apply 1.2 inches at a set. What is the allowable application rate?

Because 0.2 inches can be applied before surface runoff starts, the minimum amount that must infiltrate into the soil is 1.2 less 0.2, or 1.0 inch. From table 11–2, the maximum application rate is 0.82 inches per hour. To determine the application rate for 5 percent solids, the maximum application rate for clean water is multiplied by the reduction coefficient for 5 percent solids. The factor is 0.81 from table 11–3. Therefore, the application rate for 5 percent solids is:

$$0.82 \text{ in/hr} \times 0.81 = 0.66 \text{ in/hr}$$

The amount of application must be based upon either the nutrient requirements of the crop or consumptive use requirements of the crop, whichever factor is limiting. For example, to achieve a desired nutrient loading, the irrigation requirement might be exceeded. In this case, irrigation requirements would govern because meeting the nutrient requirement requires an excess water application, leading to excessive deep percolation and leaching of nutrients below the root zone. If meeting the irrigation requirement is not a management objective, water requirements must still be considered so that excess leaching or runoff can be avoided.

***(iv) Management considerations***—Waste must be applied in a manner that

- Prevents runoff or excessive deep percolation of the wastewater,
- Applies nutrients in amounts that do not exceed the needs of the crop, and
- Minimizes odors from the waste being applied.

Other management considerations include flushing systems with clean water to clear manure solids from pipelines and to wash waste materials from leaves of the crop, and maintenance of equipment.

### (2) Hauled

Hauling waste requires a means of transferring the waste from a collection or storage area to a container, transporting the container and waste to the application area, and spreading the waste material on the land. All consistencies of waste are suitable for hauling.

Hauling equipment provides a mechanism for evenly applying or spreading the waste to the application area. Manure spreaders or box spreaders are used primarily for solid and semi-solid manure, and tank wagons (commonly called honey wagons) and tank trucks are used for slurry and liquid manure. Injection equipment can be added to liquid and slurry spreaders for subsurface injection where odors are a problem or where maximum nutrient conservation is desired. Large volume tanker type equipment can transport the waste to the general area of application, where the waste is transferred to the application equipment. The separation of hauling equipment from the application equipment allows the economical transport of waste over considerable distances.

When transporting wastes to a field, special consideration should be given to soil and climate characteristics that limit the opportunity for waste application. As discussed in a later section, soil texture and drainage characteristics can limit trafficability at application sites. Excess traffic on the sites during certain periods of the year can lead to soil compaction and eventually to excessive surface runoff.

***(i) Pumping vs. hauling***—Pumping of animal waste generally is more economical than hauling. The most important factors in making the economical determination are the volume of waste to be applied, time requirements, capital investment, and labor and fuel costs. Figures 11–3 and 11–4 provide a method of comparing time needed to empty a waste storage facility by pumping or by hauling with a tank wagon. The availability of existing equipment must also be considered.

**Example 11-4:**
A dairy operation has a 34,000 cubic foot aboveground storage structure that needs to be emptied and a pump and pipe system that can deliver 275 gallons per minute to the field. A 1,000 gallon tank wagon is available to haul manure. It takes 17 minutes to fill the tank and make a round trip to the field. The operator estimates 1 hour of labor for pipe moving for each acre inch of waste applied, at a cost of $7 per hour.

**Questions:**

1. How much actual pumping time is required to empty the storage structure using the pump-pipeline system? Using the tank wagon?
2. What is the labor cost for pumping the waste to the field as compared to that for using a tank wagon and hauling?

**Pump-pipeline—**

$$\text{Storage} = \frac{34{,}000\ \text{ft}^3 \times 12\ \text{in}}{43{,}560\ \text{ft}^2/\text{ac} \times 1\ \text{ft}} = \frac{34{,}000 \times 12\ \text{in}}{43{,}500} = 9.4\ \text{ac-in}$$

Enter figure 11–3 at 9.4 acre-inches pumped and proceed vertically to the curves for 250 gpm and 300 gpm; 275 gpm will be halfway between the curves. Go horizontally and read 15.5 hours pumped.

**Tank wagon—**Enter figure 11–4 at 34,000 cubic feet storage. Move up vertically to the curve for a 1,000 gallon tank wagon. Move horizontally through the number of loads line (255 trips) to the cycle time (17 minutes), which is between the 15 and 20 minutes per cycle lines. Then move down vertically to the removal time in hours (about 70 hours).

Actual time to remove 34,000 cubic feet is 72.3 hours:

$$\frac{34{,}000\ \text{ft}^3 \times 7.5\ \text{gal/ft}^3}{1{,}000\ \text{gal tank/cycle}} \times \left(17\ \text{min/cycle} \times \frac{1\ \text{hr}}{60\ \text{min}}\right)$$

Pumping would require about 15 hours as compared to 70 hours to haul the waste to the field.

**Labor requirement**—From given information, 1 hour of labor is required for each acre-inch of waste applied; therefore, for 9.4 acre-inches, 9.4 hours of labor are required.

$$\text{Labor cost} = 9.4\ \text{hr} \times \$7/\text{hr}$$
$$= \$65.80$$

**Tank wagon**—Labor costs for hauling can be calculated by multiplying the emptying time by the hourly labor rate.

$$\text{Labor cost} = 72\ \text{hr} \times \$7/\text{hr}$$
$$= \$504.00$$

Labor costs for hauling wastes to the field are seven times the labor costs for pumping.

**Figure 11–3** Acre inches pumped in given time at various pumping rates



The actual cost of pumping as compared to hauling involves much more than just an analysis of labor cost, even though labor may be the largest component in many cases. Other factors include fuel costs, capital investment, maintenance, and availability of power. Even though a worker may not be physically observing a pump system during the entire pumping period, some attention is required. Therefore, the total labor cost for pumping could be underestimated. Dilution of the waste in the storage structure to make it pumpable and agitation requirements for both the pumping and hauling processes also need to be evaluated.

## (d) Application management

Successful land application of organic waste programs start with good planning. Success is measured in terms of sound economics and environmental protection. Consequently, plans must be in concert with the physical, managerial, and economic limitations of the farming operation. See chapter 2 for guidance.

The key features of a waste utilization plan include details about objectives, rates, quantities, and timing.

**Figure 11–4** Removal time for various cycle times and spreader capacities



### (1) Objectives

The primary objective of a utilization program is to use the nutrients for crop production while minimizing negative water quality impacts. A secondary objective is improvement of the soil profile through increased organic matter amendment. Where application is on pasture, the final objective is to use nutrients to grow forage while timing the application to avoid rejection of the forage by livestock.

### (2) Rates and quantities

Liquid waste materials must be applied at a rate that is compatible with the infiltration characteristics of the soil. For example, if a soil has a slow rate of intake, apply waste materials at a slow rate. Total quantities must not exceed the amount that can be used by the crop being grown or that can be safely stored in the root zone for carryover to the next crop. Rates and quantities must be carefully controlled on sites that have a high water table.

### (3) Timing

Organic waste should be applied:

- With mineralization rates considered and as close to the time of crop nutrient needs as possible. Crop growth stage curves should be consulted.
- On days when winds are relatively calm so that aerosols and odors are prevented from drifting onto neighboring areas, thus reducing odor complaints.
- When the ground is not frozen or snow covered.
- During periods that will result in minimizing leaching and runoff of the waste components.
- When the soil moisture content is such that excessive soil compaction from equipment traffic is not promoted.
- Early in the day when the ground and air are warming, as opposed to late in the day when the temperature is dropping and the air is settling.

## 651.1103 Salinity

Salinity (saline or sodic soils) is not a problem in areas that receive high rainfall amounts and have soils that are naturally leached. Excess soluble salt, however, can cause problems on some land in low rainfall areas, and the application of any material containing salt must be limited. Germination suffers and yields are reduced if the soils in these areas are not managed to minimize salt accumulation.

Poor seed germination and seedling growth have been experienced in humid areas where large amounts of broiler litter or manure have been applied just before planting time. This situation lasts only until rainfall can dilute the salts accumulated in the seed germination zone. A more probable cause of poor germination and seedling growth is the high levels of ammonia associated with the poultry manure rather than excess soluble salts. Excess soluble salts reduce the amount of soil water available to plants and can cause nutrient imbalance or deficiencies that restrict plant growth (see section 651.0604(b) in chapter 6).

Many saline or sodic soils can be farmed successfully if an abundance of irrigation water is available to leach excess salts below the root zone. Because all irrigation water contains some level of soluble salts, the application of manure to irrigated land adds an additional source of salt.

Guidelines have been developed for using waste storage pond water on cropland to minimize the risk of reducing crop yields (Sweeten 1976). The guidelines were developed primarily for data collected in the Midwest and should be used where local information is not available and when natural leaching cannot be assured.

The soluble salt content of liquid and slurry wastes in storage vary from one storage to another. It also varies during the year in any one storage. The soluble salt content can be estimated by measuring the electrical conductivity of the pond water. Electrical conductivity is reported in units of millimhos per centimeter (mmhos/cm) or micromhos per centimeter (µmhos/cm). One millimho per centimeter is equal to 1,000 micromhos per centimeter. The relationship between

salt content and electrical conductivity varies from one storage facility to another, but is generally consistent in the same facility. Sweeten found that 1 mmhos/cm in a pond was equivalent to 1,900 pounds of soluble salt per acre-foot of water; others have referenced as much as 4,200 pounds of salt per acre-foot as equivalent to 1 mmhos/cm. Table 11–4 presents typical total salts and electrical conductivity for wastes that may be applied to agricultural land.

Where natural leaching does not occur, the salt content of waste storage ponds must be considered. If sufficient salts are present in the pond to cause problems, the pond contents should be diluted with good quality water or application volumes should be limited.

Figures 11–5 through 11–7 can be used to determine appropriate dilution factors and application rates. The dilution factors are based on an annual application rate of waste plus clear water of 24 inches. If application rates are less, annual soils tests are recommended. Where no opportunity for dilution exists and undiluted wastewater is applied as recommended in figure 11–8, annual soils tests are a must. Dilution needs related to soil texture generally can be ignored where adequate leaching water can be applied by irrigation.

**Table 11–4** Total salts and electrical conductivity for various waste material (Stewart 1975)

| Source of waste | Total salts | Electrical conductivity |
|---|---|---|
| | (mg/L) | (mmhos/cm) |
| Beef cattle waste | 44 – 544 | 0.3 – 3.9 |
| Feedlot runoff | 1,810 | 13.0 |
| Food process waste | 44 – 653 | 0.3 – 4.7 |
| Municipal wastewater | 165 – 436 | 1.2 – 3.1 |
| Municipal sludge | 544 – 871 | 3.9 – 6.1 |

**Figure 11–5** Waste storage pond dilution factors for resulting low salinity on coarse textured soils




**Figure 11–6** Waste storage pond dilution factors for resulting low salinity on medium textured soils



**Example 11–5:**
Liquid waste from a 5 acre-feet dairy waste storage pond is to be applied to irrigated cropland. The annual irrigation application will be 28 inches per acre, and natural leaching is limited. The wastewater has an electrical conductivity of 2,700 µmhos/cm. The irrigation supply has an electrical conductivity of 400 µmhos/cm. The soil is clay.

**Questions:**

1. What dilution factor should be used to maintain a low salinity hazard in the irrigated cropland? What is the maximum waste application rate in inches per acre, considering salts?
2. If no dilution water is available, what is the maximum annual application of undiluted storage pond waste? How many acres would be required to apply the entire contents of the pond, again only accounting for salts?

Enter figure 11–7 with an electrical conductivity of holding pond water of 2.7 mmhos/cm (2,700 µmhos/cm). Proceed horizontally to the line for an electrical conductivity of irrigation water of 0.4 mmhos/cm (400 umhos/cm). Read down vertically to a dilution factor of 3.8 (answer to first part of question 1). For every inch of wastewater applied, 3.8 inches of irrigation water is needed.

Total wastewater application:

$$\frac{\text{Annual application (in/ac)}}{\text{Diluted waste (in/in of wastewater)}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Diluted waste} &= 1 + \text{dilution factor}\\ &= 1 + 3.8\\ &= 4.8 \text{ in}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the wastewater application in inches per acre is:

$$\frac{28 \text{ in/ac}}{4.8 \text{ in/in}} = 5.8 \text{ in/ac}$$

This is the answer to the second part of question 1.

To address the situation where no dilution water is available, enter figure 11–8 at an electrical conductivity of storage pond water of 2.7 mmhos/cm. Proceed horizontally to the curve for fine textured soils. Read down to a maximum annual irrigation of 2 inches (answer to the first part of question 2).

**Figure 11–7** Waste storage pond dilution factors for resulting low salinity on fine textured soils




**Figure 11–8** Maximum annual amount of undiluted waste storage pond water that can be added to a coarse (C), medium (M), or fine textured (F) soil



Each acre of land should receive no more than 2 inches of waste per year. To empty the 5 acre-foot storage would require:

Application area:

$$= \frac{\text{pond vol. (ac - ft)} \times 12 \text{ in/ft}}{\text{annual irrigation (in.)}}$$

$$= \frac{5 \text{ ac - ft} \times 12 \text{ in/ft}}{2 \text{ in}}$$

$$= \frac{60 \text{ ac - in}}{2 \text{ in}}$$

$$= 30 \text{ acres}$$

This is the answer to the second part of question 2.

As will be discussed in the next section, nutrients are another factor to be considered when calculating application rates.

**Figure 11–9** Distribution of nutrients between feces and urine




## 651.1104 Plant nutrients

Nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium are the major nutrients in manure that are normally managed. With reference to figure 11–9, about half of the nitrogen and over three-fourths of the potassium in as-excreted animal manure are in the liquid part, but the preponderance of phosphorus is in the solids part. Consequently, the importance of managing nutrients according to their availability and potential for transport with runoff is evident.

### (a) Nitrogen

Nitrogen (N) is one of the most important major plant nutrients in animal manure and other organic wastes. Phosphorus is challenging to manage; however, nitrogen is the most difficult to manage because of the many pathways it can follow.

Nitrogen is a key element in plant growth and crop production and is a major pollutant if excess amounts are present. Because of the complexities of the element, the nitrogen cycle and what drives it need to be understood. To understand the cycle, N needs to be traced throughout its life cycle. Figure 3–2 in chapter 3 shows a nitrogen cycle.

Nitrogen exists in one of three states in the environment—gas, liquid, or solid. It occurs in organic and inorganic forms. Although nitrogen can occur as an element, N, nitrogenous compounds (nitrogen in association with another element, such as hydrogen, H) are more important to agriculture. Ammonium ($NH_4$) and nitrate ($NO_3$) are primary plant nutrient forms.

Microbial decomposition of soil organic matter converts organic N into $NH_4$, a plant available form of nitrogen. The positively charged cation is held in the soil, and it does not leach. Negatively charged soil clay minerals and soil organic matter hold the positively charged ion. This greatly restricts its movement by percolating water (Bundy 1985). In addition to being attached to soil particles, ammonium nitrogen can be taken up by plants, consumed by micro-organisms, or transformed to ammonia gas and nitrates.

Nitrification is the conversion of $NH_4$ to nitrate $NO_3$ by soil bacteria and is a key reaction in the N cycle. $NO_3$ is readily available to plants and is an important form of N to most crops; however, negatively charged nitrate remains in the soil solution and readily moves with water.

Nitrates can also be reduced by bacteria, with nitrogen lost to the atmosphere in gaseous form. This process is called denitrification. In the nitrate form, nitrogen can leach through soil because it is an anion that has low sorptive capacity and does not form insoluble precipitates. Generally, nitrate has the greatest pollution potential of the three elements and limits the amount of organic waste that can be safely applied on the land.

### (b) Phosphorus

The phosphorus cycle (see fig. 3–3 in chapter 3) shows that phosphorus can have some of the same pathways as nitrogen. Low solubilities of the mineral forms of phosphorus, when combined with calcium, iron, or aluminum, and its high potential for adsorption to clay particles result in a low tendency of leaching in most soils. The exception is in sandy soils that are low in clay content and organic material (carbon). Although the conversion rate of phosphorus in the soil to insoluble forms varies among soils, availability for plant uptake of phosphorus in the soil does decrease rapidly with time. Chemical reactions in the soil immobilize about half of the added soluble phosphate within the first day, with additional retention over the first month (Ghoshal 1974 and Larsen 1965). Soil phosphorus can be a potential source of contamination to surface water for both sediment-attached and soluble phosphorus in runoff.

### (c) Potassium

Potassium is an important macronutrient for plant growth (see chapter 6). Native grasses that have an abundance of nitrogen available for uptake have been reported to show essentially no production when little to no potassium is available (Wagner 1968).

Potassium is moderately soluble in water and is known to be available for transport in surface runoff or by leaching through the soil. It is also fixed in most soils, exchanging with such soil elements as calcium, sodium, magnesium, and ammonium.

Water quality problems are not associated with potassium if it is applied at agronomic rates. These problems can occur only where manure or other organic materials are applied on the land in amounts in excess of 100 tons per acre for disposal purposes. In those cases, other more serious problems associated with organic material, nitrogen, phosphorus, and bacteria would most likely overshadow the problems associated with potassium. At any rate, agricultural wastes applied on land for disposal purposes only are outside the scope of this handbook.

**Summary:** Nitrogen or phosphorus, or both, will in all cases be the nutrient that controls planning and implementation of programs for land application of agricultural waste materials for crop production and environmental protection. Other constituents, such as organic matter and bacteria, also need to be addressed in the management program.

## 651.1105 Nutrient management

A variety of factors must be considered in designing nutrient management programs. Production and environmental goals need to be balanced, and these goals might not always be compatible. Crop nutrient requirements should be met, and soil limiting features must be considered.

Waste utilization programs must be designed for a limiting nutrient, either nitrogen or phosphorus. Application of organic material that contains a predominance of nitrogen generally must be designed with the nitrogen as the limiting nutrient. The deficiencies of other nutrients are supplied by commercial fertilizer. Organic materials high in phosphorus should have land application areas sized with phosphorus as the limiting nutrient.

In most cases, environmental and water resource considerations relate to nitrogen being the constituent of concern for ground water, and phosphorus is of concern in surface water, although both can be limiting in either surface or ground water. Phosphorus movement can be a problem, for example, in erodible soils that are on a sloping landscape and have a water supply reservoir in close proximity. Nitrogen leaching presents problems in areas having shallow aquifers used for drinking water.

A nutrient management program must be planned to account for all the pathways of nutrient transformation and movement as it is produced and released from agricultural wastes. The conservation practice standard Nutrient Management (590) must be followed in developing a nutrient balance for the cropping rotation. Nutrient management is an essential component of an agricultural waste management system. Plans should be based on soil tests, crop yields, manure nutrient analyses, and environmental concerns of the farm enterprise. The plan must account for the nutrients available in the waste, the crop's requirement for the nutrients, and timing and method of application. It should be formulated to minimize the potential offsite losses of nutrients by runoff, leaching, and volatilization.

Both the pathways and transformation of the two major crop nutrients in waste are complex. While nitrogen generally is in higher concentrations and quantities than phosphorus, its availability and predictability of form is less certain. Though phosphorus is not considered a health risk when found in high quantities in surface or ground water, it is considered an environmental threat to fresh water because of the potential enrichment of water bodies that can lead to eutrophic conditions. Nitrogen nutrients are fleeting in the soil and plant environment and only accumulate in some organic forms. Phosphorus does accumulate in the soil and can build to levels that become enriched as sediment and runoff.

Soil fertility in connection with phosphorus management should focus on soil tests, tillage practices, and application methods. Soils that show adequate phosphorus levels may not require addition of fertilizer. A soil test level does exist that makes additional nutrient applications an environmental risk. These excessive soil constituent levels should be considered in each State, and guidance should be given for prolonged application of nutrients.

Water budgets are essential evaluation tools needed for establishing nutrient budgets. In areas that have ground water concerns, figure 11–10 shows that nutrient application plans need to be structured to account for periods of excess movement of water into and over the soil.

Using figure 11–10, for example, the period of maximum deep percolation is August through November, with the deepest percolation occurring in September. Smaller quantities of deep percolation occur October through March and again in June.

Generally, if nutrients in organic form are applied in the fall, especially early fall, and mineralize, the soluble fraction tends to move with deep percolating water. If they are not incorporated, they move with surface runoff. Nutrients applied and incorporated late in spring or early in summer may not be available for percolation or runoff, but also may not be available when needed by the plants (as indicated by the shape of the evapotranspiration curve, which somewhat matches the nutrient uptake curve).

The optimum time for nutrient application based on figure 11–10 would be late in winter or early in spring so the nutrients will be readily available to plants. If the nutrients in a waste material are less available, such as with manure solids mixed with bedding giving a higher C:N ratio, incorporating the waste late in fall or early in winter allows additional time for the waste to mineralize, releasing nutrients as the plants begin growing in the spring. The objective is to match the timing of the crop's nutrient uptake requirement with the release of nutrients from the manure.

## (a) Nutrient losses

Nutrient losses can be grouped into two general categories—those from the manure before it is incorporated into the soil and those within the soil after incorporation.

To accurately determine the amount of nutrients reaching the ground, samples collected at the soil surface must be analyzed. Because this procedure generally is not done, the nutrient losses can be estimated using procedures that follow. Tabular values and calculations are included to demonstrate accounting for the major nutrients in manure.

**Figure 11–10** Example of a water budget for winter wheat



### (1) Before incorporation

Nutrient losses from manure before incorporation into the soil vary widely, depending on the method of collection, storage, treatment, and application. These losses must be considered when calculating the amount of nutrients available for plant uptake. Climate and management have the greatest effect on the losses. Volatilization losses are more rapid during warm weather and as the wind increases. They also increase with the length of storage or treatment. Microbial activity almost ceases when the temperature falls below 41 °F (5 °C). Thus most volatilization losses cease in the fall and do not resume again until spring. This is a natural conservation phenomenon.

Local information should be used if available. In the absence of local data, tables 11–5 and 11–6 give estimates that may be used.

**Table 11–5** Percent of original nutrient content of manure retained by various management systems

| Management system | Beef | | | Dairy | | | Poultry | | | Swine | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | P | K | N | P | K | N | P | K | N | P | K |
| | Percent | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Manure stored in open lot, cool, humid region | 55-70 | 70-80 | 55-70 | 70-85 | 85-95 | 85-95 | | | | 55-70 | 65-80 | 55-70 |
| Manure stored in open lot, hot, arid region | 40-60 | 70-80 | 55-70 | 55-70 | 85-95 | 85-95 | | | | | | |
| Manure liquids and solids stored in a covered, essentially watertight structure | 70-85 | 85-95 | 85-95 | 70-85 | 85-95 | 85-95 | | | | 75-85 | 85-95 | 85-95 |
| Manure liquids and solids stored in an uncovered, essentially watertight structure | 60-75 | 80-90 | 80-90 | 65-75 | 80-90 | 80-90 | | | | 70-75 | 80-90 | 80-90 |
| Manure liquids and solids (diluted less than 50 %) held in waste storage pond | | | | 65-80 | 80-95 | 80-95 | | | | | | |
| Manure and bedding held in roofed storage | | | | 65-80 | 80-95 | 80-95 | 55-70 | 80-95 | 80-95 | | | |
| Manure and bedding held in unroofed storage, leachate lost | | | | 55-75 | 75-85 | 75-85 | | | | | | |
| Manure stored in pits beneath slatted floor | 70-85 | 85-95 | 85-95 | 70-85 | 90-95 | 90-95 | 80-90 | 90-95 | 90-95 | 70-85 | 90-95 | 90-95 |
| Manure treated in anaerobic lagoon or stored in waste storage pond after being diluted more than 50% | 20-35 | 35-50 | 50-65 | 20-35 | 35-50 | 50-65 | 20-30 | 35-50 | 50-60 | 20-30 | 35-50 | 50-60 |

Table 11–5 shows nutrients remaining for manure that has been stored or treated. It includes the consideration of losses during the collection process.

Losses in the application process can be estimated using the information in table 11–6. These losses are in addition to those considered in forming table 11–5.

Timing of waste incorporation is critical to conserving the nitrogen in the manure. Volatilization loses increase with time, higher temperature, wind, and low humidity. To minimize volatilization losses, manure should be incorporated before it dries. The allowable time before a significant loss occurs varies with the climate. Manure applied to cool, wet soils does not dry readily and thus does not volatilize for several days. Manure applied to hot, dry soil dries quickly and loses most of the ammonia fraction within 24 hours, particularly if there is a hot, dry wind.

If the manure has been stored under anaerobic conditions, more than 50 percent of the total nitrogen is in the ammonium form, which readily volatilizes on drying and is lost. Dried manure, such as that from a feedlot in an arid or semi-arid climate, has already lost much of its ammonium nitrogen through formation of ammonia gas. There is little additional loss with time.

### (2) After incorporation

Some nitrogen losses occur within the soil after manure has been incorporated. Nitrogen is lost from the soil primarily by leaching and denitrification; however, organic nitrogen must be transformed or mineralized for this to happen. Losses of phosphorus and potassium are minimal after incorporation, but the mineralization process does take place. Mineralization is discussed in this chapter.

***(i) Leaching***—As discussed earlier, nitrogen in the nitrate form is soluble and can pass through the root zone with percolating water. Water moving into the soil profile from rainfall, snow melt, and irrigation drive soluble nutrients through the profile. Losses are to be minimized by applying organic materials in amounts that the plants can use. The applications should be before or at the time of plant uptake and in harmony with the water budget.

In irrigated areas, good water management is needed to prevent excessive leaching of soluble nutrients. Some leaching will occur, however, if excess irrigation water is used to flush salts below the root zone.

The nutrient management plan must be developed with considerations to minimize leaching losses. In addition to the water budget, the rate of manure application, its timing, and the crop uptake requirement must be considered. The Soil Leaching Index referred from section II of the Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) is to be used in developing the manure utilization program to estimate nitrate leaching. Table 11–7 should only be used to provide general guidance in planning, as shown in example 11–6.

The Leaching Index (LI) is a seasonally weighted estimate of nitrogen leaching potential. The probability of nutrients leaching below the root zone is dependent on the LI. An LI of less than 2 inches is unlikely to contribute to a problem, 2 to 10 inches is a possible contributor, and more than 10 inches is a likely contributor (Williams & Kissel 1991).

**Table 11–6** Percentage of nitrogen of that in the applied manure still potentially available to the soil (Ammonia volatilization causes the predicted losses) (Willrich, et.al. 1974)

| Application method | Percentage remaining/delivered | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Injection | 95 | | |
| Sprinkling | 75 | | |
| Broadcast (fresh solids) | | | |
| Days between application | Soil conditions | | |
| and incorporation | warm dry | warm wet | cool wet |
| 1 | 70 | 90 | 100 |
| 4 | 60 | 80 | 95 |
| 7 or more | 50 | 70 | 90 |

Nutrient management practices and techniques must be applied on soils that have a high leaching index. See the FOTG for guidance.

***(ii) Denitrification***—Nitrogen can also be lost from the root zone through denitrification. This occurs when nitrogen in the nitrate form is subject to anaerobic activity. If an energy source is available in the form of carbon (and it generally is within the root zone) and if other conditions favor the growth of anaerobic bacteria, the bacteria will convert the nitrates to the gaseous form as nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which then escapes into the atmosphere. Because manure is more carbonaceous than commercial fertilizer and carbon is a common energy source, some denitrification will most likely occur.

Anaerobic conditions in the soil generally are controlled by soil water content (reflected in soil drainage classes) and available soil carbon (reflected in soil organic matter levels). Table 11–8 gives a gross estimate of the percent denitrification from all inorganic nitrogen in soils related to various drainage classes and organic matter content. This table assumes that nitrate concentrations are not limited, denitrifying microbes are present, and temperature is suitable for denitrification.

## (b) Nutrient mineralization

Once manure is in the soil, the nutrients available to a plant depend on the rate of mineralization (converted to the inorganic form) and from the amount remaining after losses through leaching and denitrification. Organic and inorganic manure nutrients are in the soil. The amount of inorganic nutrients available from manure depends on the rate of biological conversion from the organic state. The inorganic forms are soluble and available for plant uptake. The rate of conversion is called the mineralization or decay rate and is generally expressed as a decay series in terms of percent change of the original amount.

**Table 11–7** An estimate of inorganic nitrogen losses to leaching related to the soil Leaching Index*

| Leaching index | Inorganic N losses by leaching (%) |
|---|---|
| <2 | 5 |
| 2 – 10 | 10 |
| >10 | 15 |

* This table should be used to provide general guidance in planning.

The rate for nitrogen mineralization depends on the

- concentration of total nitrogen in the manure,
- amount in the urea or uric acid form (organic nitrogen in the urine fraction),
- temperature and moisture conditions,
- amount of organic N (or mineralizable N) already in the soil, and
- C:N ratio.

Nitrogen is excreted in various forms, depending on the animal (Conn & Stumpf 1972). Fish excrete substantial amounts of nitrogen as ammonia ($NH_3$). Birds, including poultry, excrete a high percentage as uric acid. Mammals excrete about half of their nitrogen in urine as urea and the rest in the feces as undigested organic matter and synthesized microbial cells (Azevedo & Stout 1974). Uric acid and urea are unstable and are rapidly metabolized by micro-organisms and converted to the inorganic form, ammonium. The feces, however, is mineralized much more slowly.

Poultry manure has a faster mineralization rate than cattle or swine manure because it has a higher concentration of nitrogen, mostly in the form of uric acid. Fresh manure has a faster mineralization rate than that of old manure because it contains a higher percentage of the nitrogen in the urea form. Urea is easily transformed to ammonia. Generally manure that has a higher concentration of nitrogen mineralizes faster than that with a low concentration.

The mineralization rate can also be affected by the C:N ratio. See chapter 4 for some selected C:N values of manure. The common C:N ratio of excreted manure is below 20:1. If straw, sawdust, or other high carbon to nitrogen materials are used for bedding, the C:N ratio of the resulting material becomes higher and more of the nitrogen becomes immobilized by the micro-organism into the organic component. This nitrogen tied up by the microbes becomes less available for plant uptake during this interval. Consideration should be given to compensate for this temporary lag in nitrogen mineralization from the manure when developing the nutrient management plan.

A higher percentage of the total nitrogen in manure incorporated into the soil is converted to inorganic nitrogen in the first year than in the second. More is converted in the second year than in the third year. This occurs because the easily biodegradable part is mineralized quickly and the residue is mineralized slowly. Soil micro-organisms use the part of the waste that gives them the most energy first and the part that yields the least energy last. Again, the urine fraction is used first and the feces part last.

Research data on mineralization are limited. Pratt (1976) found the decay series for fresh bovine manure incorporated daily to be 0.75; 0.15; 0.10; 0.05. This means that 75 percent of the incorporated nitrogen becomes available the first year, 15 percent of the remaining nitrogen becomes available in the second year, 10 percent of the remainder in the third year, and so on. Theoretically, with enough time almost 100 percent of the incorporated nitrogen will be converted to the inorganic form.

For example, if fresh cattle manure is applied every year at the rate of 100 pounds of total nitrogen per acre, 75 pounds (75 percent) will be available the first year. In year 2, 15 percent of the remaining 25 pounds becomes available, or 4 pounds (rounded from 3.75).

In the second year, however, 75 pounds will also be available from the second manure application. Thus, 79 pounds are available in year 2. The nitrogen available in the third year would be the sum of that available from year 3, year 2, and year 1.

Although not as well documented as the nitrogen cycle, similar cyclic relationships exist for phosphorus and, to some extent, for potassium. The mineralization rate for phosphorus and potassium are generally more rapid than that for nitrogen, reflecting a larger proportion of the nutrients in available form as excreted.

Table 11–9 displays the rate of mineralization of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium for some typical manures and management conditions. As has been previously discussed, the rate of mineralization for nitrogen is proportional to the amount of the nutrient conserved in waste collection, storage, treatment, and application.

Microbial activity necessary for nitrogen mineralization is dependent on soil moisture. The mineralization is accelerated in moist soils as compared to the same soil where the profile is dry. Table 11–9 values for nitrogen should be reduced 5 to 10 percent in arid and semi-arid areas where irrigation is not used. Local mineralization rates should be used if data are available.

### (c) Nutrient requirements

Manure can provide part, all, or even excessive amounts of the nutrients required for plant production. The amount of nutrients required by plants must be determined as part of the nutrient management program.

**Table 11–8** Approximate N denitrification estimates for various soils — See footnote for adjustments because of tillage, manure N, irrigation, drainage, and special soil conditions (Meisinger & Randall 1991)

| Soil organic matter content | Soil drainage classification: Excessively well drained | Well drained | Moderately well drained | Somewhat poorly drained | Poorly drained |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % | % of inorganic N (fert., precip.) denitrified* | | | | |
| <2 | 2–4 | 3–9 | 4–14 | 6–20 | 10–30 |
| 2–5 | 3–9 | 4–16 | 6–20 | 10–25 | 15–45 |
| >5 | 4–12 | 6–20 | 10–25 | 15–35 | 25–55 |

* Adjust for tillage, manure, irrigation, and special soils as follows: For no-tillage, use one class wetter drainage; **for manure N, double all values**; for tile drained soils, use one class better drainage; for paddy culture, use values under poorly drained; for irrigation or humid climates, use value at upper end of range; for arid or semi-arid nonirrigated sites, use values at lower end of range; for soils with compacted, very slowly permeable layer below plow depth, but above 4 feet deep, use one class wetter drainage.

The most effective way to determine the crops' needs is to develop a nutrient management plan based on the Nutrient Management conservation practice standard (590). The standard uses the components of a nutrient balance program starting with setting yield goals, soil and manure analysis, and plant nutrient availability for the growing season. A nutrient budget worksheet can be used to collect and calculate the information needed for a nutrient management plan. The local State Cooperative Extension Service values for crop recommendations, yield productions, manure nutrient mineralization rates, and soil test results can be used on the worksheet.

Two strategies can be used for manure utilization: 1) management for maximum nutrient efficiency, and 2) management for maximum application rate of manure.

**Srategy 1—Management for maximum nutrient efficiency.** The rate of application is based on the nutrient available at the highest level to meet the crop's needs. For most animal waste, this element is phosphorus. The manure rate is calculated to meet the requirement of phosphorus, and additional amounts of nitrogen and potassium are added from other sources (generally commercial fertilizers). This rate is most conservative and requires the greater supplement of fertilizer, but applies nutrients in the quantities that do not exceed the recommended rates for the crop.

**Strategy 2—Management for maximum application rate of manure.** The most abundant element in the manure, generally nitrogen, is used to the greatest extent possible. The manure rate is calculated to meet the nitrogen need of the crop. This maximizes the

**Table 11–9** General mineralization rates for nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium*

| Waste and management | Years after initial application | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Nitrogen | | | Phosphorus | | | Potassium | | |
| | Percent available (accumulative) | | | | | | | | |
| Fresh poultry manure | 90 | 92 | 93 | 80 | 88 | 93 | 85 | 93 | 98 |
| Fresh swine or cattle manure | 75 | 79 | 81 | 80 | 88 | 93 | 85 | 93 | 98 |
| Layer manure from pit storage | 80 | 82 | 83 | 80 | 88 | 93 | 85 | 93 | 98 |
| Swine or cattle manure stored in covered storage | 65 | 70 | 73 | 75 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 88 | 93 |
| Swine or cattle manure stored in open structure or pond (undiluted) | 60 | 66 | 68 | 75 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 88 | 93 |
| Cattle manure with bedding stored in roofed area | 60 | 66 | 68 | 75 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 88 | 93 |
| Effluent from lagoon or diluted waste storage pond | 40 | 46 | 49 | 75 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 88 | 93 |
| Manure stored on open lot, cool-humid | 50 | 55 | 57 | 80 | 88 | 93 | 85 | 93 | 98 |
| Manure stored on open lot, hot-arid | 45 | 50 | 53 | 75 | 85 | 90 | 80 | 88 | 93 |

* Table assumes annual applications on the same site. If a one time application, the decay series can be estimated by subtracting year 1 from year 2 and year 2 from year 3. For example, the decay series for nitrogen from fresh poultry manure would be 0.90, 0.02, 0.01; the decay series for phosphorus from manure stored in open lot, cool-humid, would be 0.80, 0.08 and 0.05. The decay rate becomes essentially constant after 3 years.

application rate of manure, but will over apply phosphorus and potassium for the crop's requirement. Over the long term this will lead to an undesirable accumulation of plant nutrients in the soil.

## (d) Nutrient accounting

The nutrients available for plant growth can be determined by an accounting procedure. A procedure for determining manure application in wet tons (actual weight) per acre for solids and slurries and in acre-inches per acre for liquids is included. The procedure is reasonable for estimating the available nutrients, acres needed for application, and application rates.

Variability of manure, differences in site and climate conditions, and the lack of localized research data are factors that influence accuracy of estimates. However, sampling of manure throughout the process will help minimize influences of variations and provide confidence in the accounting method.

The mineralization series and the accounting for previous applications of manure may be of no value unless the farm owner/operator keeps adequate records over the years so the history of each field is known. If the owner/operator does not have records, the soil should be tested or the application should be adjusted on the basis of experience or crop yields.

## (e) Accounting procedure

Figure 11-11 displays the following steps for nitrogen.

**Step 1. Estimate nutrients in the excreted manure.**

The starting point for all calculations is to estimate the total nutrient content of the manure as excreted. Use State Cooperative Extension Service research or local information to derive the nutrient concentration (N, $P_2O_5$, $K_2O$) in the manure. If manure tests or local information is not available, use tables in chapter 4 that show the average nutrient production for various animals. Use the worksheets in chapter 10 to compute manure production.

**Step 2. Add nutrients in wastewater, dropped feed, and added bedding.**

Wastewater, such as feedlot runoff, milking center waste, and other process water, may also be applied to the soil for recycling of the contained nutrients (see the worksheets in chapter 10). Also see appropriate tables in chapter 4 for the nutrient content of wastewater. Because of the variability caused by dilution, feeding, and climate, wastewater samples should be analyzed to determine the nutrient content. Convert the elemental nutrients given in the tables in chapter 4 to fertilizer equivalents (N, $P_2O_5$, $K_2O$).

**Step 3. Subtract nutrients lost during storage.**

Account for all losses of nutrients in the manure from the time it is excreted until it is ready to be applied to the field. Table 11–5 gives a range of nutrients retained in the manure that has been stored or treated by various methods. Multiply the percent retained (table 11–5) by the total nutrients from step 2 to obtain the nutrient value after storage and at the time of field application.

**Step 4. Determine the plant available nutrients contained in the manure.**

Use State Cooperative Extension Service information, if available, to determine the fraction of the plant available nutrients that will be released by the manure over the first crop growing season. A manure analysis that gives results as plant-available nutrients is preferred. A large fraction of the inorganic nitrogen (the ammonium and nitrate), phosphorus, and potassium are plant-available the first year. Only a part of the organic nitrogen ( the total nitrogen minus the inorganic nitrogen) is broken down by micro-organisms each year and made available to the plants. If localized data are not available, use table 11–9. It gives values for mineralization rates of nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium following land applications for several wastes and management options. The values in the columns represent the mineralization rate (plant availability) of one year's manure application over a three consecutive year period of cropping with additional manure application occurring each year. The values in table 11–9 are accumulative, thus give the

total available nutrients for a year from applications made in previous years. Use the value of year 3 for each subsequent year past year 3 that manure is applied. Multiply the mineralization factor for each of the nutrients by the total nutrients ready for land application (from step 3).

**Step 5. Determine the nutrients required by the crop and soil to produce the yield goal.**

Step 5 should be used when waste analysis, soil tests, and State Cooperative Extension Service recommendations are available. This is the best basis for managing nutrients. Proceed to step 5a if needed data are not available. The use of step 5a is not recommended for calculating a nutrient budget for a nutrient management plan, but may be used for general planning and estimating land application area requirements. The variation in nitrogen availability would cause discrepancies (either deficits or excess) in nitrogen recommendations.

**Figure 11–11** Nitrogen transformation in the accounting procedure



variation in nitrogen availability would cause discrepancies (either deficits or excess) in nitrogen recommendations.

State Cooperative Extension Service guidelines for nutrient requirements are based on soil tests, crop yields, and local field trials. Soil fertility recommendations are given in Extension bulletins and on soil test reports.

**Step 5a.** In lieu of a soil test or local State Cooperative Extension Service crop nutrient recommendation, an estimate can be made of the nutrient requirements to produce the crop at the yield goal set. The estimate accounts for the removal of the nutrients in the harvested crop and the anticipated loss because of denitrification and leaching in the soil, but nutrient additions can also occur. No attempt is made to account for losses caused by erosion, volatilization, or immobilization.

1. Estimate the amount of nutrient removed by the harvested plant materials. Table 6–6 in chapter 6 provides an estimate of the nutrients concentration in the harvested part of the crop. Multiply the yield goal by the volume weight (in pounds per unit measure) and the fraction of the nutrient concentration. The values for phosphorus and potassium are expressed in the elemental form and must be converted to $P_2O_5$ and $K_2O$.

2. Add to the plant material requirement the soil potential for denitrification. Table 11–8 provides a rough estimate of potential denitrification losses that can be expected for a specific field condition. This estimate is for the inorganic fraction of the nitrogen available from the manure during the growing season and dependent on the soil drainage class and soil organic matter content. It is also dependent on the conditions in the soil being present for denitrification to take place. Only nitrogen will undergo this process.

3. Add to the plant material requirement and denitrification potential loss the potential loss that could occur when nitrate nitrogen leaches below the root zone. Table 11–7 provides estimates of the percent of the inorganic nitrogen applied that can be lost by leaching based on the Leaching Index. Adding steps 5a 1, 2, and 3 gives an estimate of the nitrogen balance in the system. Again, phosphorus and potassium are not considered.

   Leaching losses are difficult to estimate on a site specific basis because it is dependent on local information, such as rainfall and nutrient additions. Local data may be available from field trial and nitrogen prediction models, such as NLEAP (Nitrate Leaching and Economic Analysis Package) (Shaffer et al. 1991). Leaching losses may range from 5 to 40 percent of the inorganic nitrogen available in the soil profile.

4. Because additions to the nitrogen pool occur, they must be considered so that nutrients are not over applied. The sources of additional nitrogen are:
   - Mineralization of soil organic matter
   - Atmospheric deposition
   - Residue mineralization
   - Irrigation water
   - Credits from legumes

   No adjustment for any of these additions are in the example, but they can be substantial. These additions need to be subtracted from the estimated nitrogen needed. General values for nitrogen mineralized per acre from soil organic matter (SOM) are 40 pounds per year for each 1 percent of SOM. Nitrogen from atmospheric deposition ranges up to 26 pounds per acre per year. (Local data must be available before adding this value). Legumes can result in another 30 to 150 pounds of nitrogen per acre per year. Irrigation additions can be estimated by multiplying the nitrogen concentration in parts per million by the quantity of water applied in acre-inches by 0.227. Additions of nutrients form crop residue may be calculated using information in table 6–6, and manure residual release of nutrients is given in table 11–9.

**Step 6. Compute increased nitrogen to compensate for application losses.**

Table 11-6 is used to estimate the volatilization of ammonium nitrogen that can occur when manure is applied to the soil.

**Step 7. Select nutrient for calculation of manure application rates.**

Consider the soil test levels, crop requirements, and environmental vulnerability in selecting the critical nutrient for calculating application rates of manure. The ratio of the nutrients (N, $P_2O_5$, $K_2O$) in the manure can be compared with the ratio of plant nutrients required. If ratio imbalance is present, every effort should be made to minimize applications that exceed soil test limits or crop requirements.

**Step 8. Compute the acres on which manure can be applied to use the nutrients available.**

Using the critical nutrient selected (step 7), divide the amount of plant available nutrients in the manure (step 4) by the amount of nutrients required per acre for production of the crop (step 6). This is the number of acres that will be supplied by the selected nutrients for crop production. Supplemental nutrients may have to be supplied from other sources (for example, commercial fertilizer) to complete the total crop and soil requirements for the selected yield goal.

**Step 9. Determine application rate of manure.**

Solid, semi-solid, and slurry manure—Determine the application rate. Divide the weight of manure to be applied in tons by the acres required (step 8) to give tons per acre.

Liquid manure—These computations assume that the manure has been diluted enough to act as a liquid. Field application is normally by pipelines and sprinklers, but the manure can be hauled and applied. To determine the application rate, divide the volume of manure and liquids to be applied in acre-inches by the acres required (step 8) to give acre-inches per acre.

**Step 10. Further considerations.**

Where the application rates solely based on one nutrient result in excessive amounts of other nutrients, the long-term impact must be considered. Continual overapplication of phosphorus or potassium may not be detrimental in soils that have a high affinity to adsorb and hold these nutrients from erosion and leaching. Yet in soils that do not have these holding characteristics, the contamination of water bodies is a potential hazard.

Nitrogen applications in excess of plant requirements should not be practiced because of the environmental and health problems that can occur. In some situations the amount of land available is not adequate to use the total quantities of nutrients in the waste. Alternatives should be explored to use the excess manure produced. Some possibilities are additional land acquisition, agreement to apply on neighboring farms, decrease in animal numbers, composting and off-farm sales, refeeding of waste, mechanical separation and reuse of solids as bedding, and treatment to increase the nutrient losses in environmentally safe ways. It also may be possible to change the cropping rotation for greater utilization of the nutrients.

If no solution is apparent, a more detailed planning effort should be considered to formulate another alternative for the agricultural waste management system. (See chapter 2.) State and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding land application of organic materials must be met.

**Example 11–6:**
**Given:** 200 lactating dairy cows in central Wisconsin, average weight 1,200 pounds, are confined all year. All manure and milking parlor/milkhouse wastewater are pumped into an uncovered waste storage pond (SCS Practice Code 425). The bottom of the pond is 60 by 200 feet, and the maximum operating depth is 12 feet. Side slopes are 2:1. Milking parlor plus milk-house wastewater amount equals 5 gal/cow/day. Manure is applied every spring and plowed down within 1 day. No runoff from holding areas or adjoining fields is allowed to flow into the pond. Land is used for grain corn and has received manure for a number of years. Mean annual precipitation is 32 inches, evaporation from the pond surface is 12 inches, and the 25-year, 24-hour storm is 6 inches.

Soils on the sites for waste application are moderately well drained silt loam and have a leaching index of 6 (6 inches percolates below the root zone) and an organic matter content of 3 percent. The yield goal for grain corn is 130 bushels per acre. The soils are subject to frequent flooding and have 10 percent, by volume, rock fractions that are greater than 3 inches in diameter. Slopes range up to 10 percent. A 3,000 gallon tank wagon is available for spreading the liquid manure.

**Questions:**

1. What is the amount of nutrients available after mineralization (assume 3 consecutive years of application)?
2. What are the net available nutrients after leaching, denitrification, and other losses?
3. Estimate the area required, based on nitrogen being the critical nutrient.
4. What area would be required to use the maximum amount of nutrients?
5. What is the application rate in tons per acre for the area that would provide maximum nutrient utilization?
6. What number of passes per day with the tank wagon would be required to apply the manure?
7. For an irrigation system design, determine the total depth of wastewater application for nutrients that have nitrogen control, and assess adjustments needed for phosphorus control.

**Solution:**

**Step 1. Estimate the total nutrients (NPK) in the excreted manure.**

Nutrients per storage period = Number of animals x weight (lb) x daily nutrient production (lb/day/1,000 lb) x storage period (days).

Nutrient values for as excreted dairy cow manure are obtained from table 4–5, chapter 4.

$$N = \frac{200 \times 1,200 \times 0.45 \times 365}{1,000} = 39,420 \text{ lb}$$

$$P = \frac{200 \times 1,200 \times 0.07 \times 365}{1,000} = 6,130 \text{ lb}$$

$$K = \frac{200 \times 1,200 \times 0.26 \times 365}{1,000} = 22,780 \text{ lb}$$

**Step 2. Add nutrients contained in wastewater.**

No field runoff enters the waste storage pond. Nutrients in the parlor/milkhouse wastewater are calculated as follows:

Based on observations and using table 4–6 as a guide, 5 gal/cow/day was estimated to be representative. Estimate the nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium involved to be equal to the values provided in table 4–6 of 1.67, 0.83, and 2.50 lb/1,000 gal. of wastewater. This results in a small amount of double accounting because some manure affected the values in table 4–6; however, the answer will still be reasonable and slightly conservative.

Nutrients in the wastewater = Number of animals x daily wastewater production (gal./day/cow) x daily nutrient production (lb. of nutrient/1,000 gal.) x no. of days.

$$N = \frac{200 \times 5 \times 1.67 \times 365}{1,000 \text{ gal}} = 610 \text{ lb}$$

$$P = \frac{200 \times 5 \times 0.83 \times 365}{1,000 \text{ gal}} = 300 \text{ lb}$$

$$K = \frac{200 \times 5 \times 2.50 \times 365}{1,000 \text{ gal}} = 910 \text{ lb}$$

Total nutrients produced:

$$\text{Total N} = 39,420 + 610 = 40,030 \text{ lb}$$
$$\text{Total P} = 6,130 + 300 = 6,430 \text{ lb}$$
$$\text{Total K} = 22,780 + 910 = 23,690 \text{ lb}$$

Converting to fertilizer form:

$$\text{Total N} = 40,030 \text{ lb}$$
$$\text{Total } P_2O_5 = 6,430 \times 2.29 = 14,725$$
$$\text{Total } K_2O = 23,640 \times 1.21 = 28,604$$

**Step 3. Subtract nutrients lost during storage.**

From table 11–5, estimate values using entry for "manure liquids and solids held in waste storage pond (diluted less than 50 percent)." The lower values should be used because dilution is about equal to 50 percent. Multiply the percent retained (from table 11–5) by the total nutrients from step 2 to compute the amount of nutrients remaining after the storage losses.

Nutrients after storage losses = Total nutrients produced x fraction retained = Amount available for land application.

$$N = 40,030 \times 0.65 = 26,020 \text{ lb}$$
$$P_2O_5 = 14,725 \times 0.80 = 11,780$$
$$K_2O = 28,604 \times 0.80 = 22,883$$

**Step 4. Determine the plant available nutrients.**

Using table 11–9, estimate the amount of nutrients that will be available each year after the third consecutive year of application.

Plant available nutrients = Amount applied x fraction available

$$N = 26,020 \text{ lb} \times 0.55 \left(\text{est}\right) = 14,311 \text{ lb}$$
$$P_2O_5 = 11,780 \times 0.90 = 10,602$$
$$K_2O = 22,883 \times 0.93 = 21,281$$

This is the answer to question 1.

**Note:** 0.55 was used for nitrogen because in table 11–9 it fell between 0.68 for an open pond condition and 0.49 for a diluted waste storage pond.

**Step 5. Determine the nutrients required by the crop and soil to produce the yield goal.**

Generally, a soil analysis would be taken and the State Cooperative Extension Service recommendation would be used, but for illustrative purposes the method to estimate nutrient requirements given in chapter 6 will be used. An example in chapter 6 provides the nutrients removed by the harvest of 130 bushels of corn.

**Step 5a (1). Estimate the amount of nutrients removed by the crop using table 6–6.**

(See section 651.0606(b), Nutrient uptake example.)

$$N = 117 \text{ lb/ac}$$
$$P = 20$$
$$K = 29$$

Converting to fertilizer form:

$$N = 117 \text{ lb/ac}$$
$$P_2O_5 = 20 \times 2.29 = 46$$
$$K_2O = 29 \times 1.21 = 35$$

**Step 5a (2). Add to the plant requirements additional nitrogen to replace anticipated denitrification losses.**

From table 11–8 for a moderately well drained soil that has an organic matter content of 3 percent, the table gives a value of 26 percent denitrified. (Estimating 13 percent and doubling for manure gives 26 percent.)

Nitrogen needed considering denitrification = Plant requirements from Step 5a (1) divided by the percent retained as a decimal after denitrification, which is 100 percent less the percent lost (from table 11–7).

$$N = \frac{117}{0.74} = 158 \text{ lb}$$

An additional 41 pounds of nitrogen is needed to compensate for the anticipated denitrification losses.

**Step 5a (3). Add to the plant requirements additional nitrogen to replace anticipated leaching losses.**

From table 11–7, for a leaching index of 6 (6 inches of annual percolation below the root zone), the estimated loss is 10 percent. This means 90 percent of the nitrogen would be retained. Divide the amount of nitrogen required from step 5a (2) by the percent retained (0.90) to increase the nitrogen to provide adequate nitrogen for the plant after losses anticipated from leaching.

Nitrogen = Nitrogen required anticipating denitrification losses divided by the percent retained (as a decimal) after leaching losses.

$$N = \frac{158}{0.9} = 176 \text{ lb}$$

An additional 18 pounds of nitrogen is needed to compensate for the anticipated leaching losses.

**Step 6. Add additional nitrogen to compensate for application losses.**

From table 11-6 determine the nitrogen anticipated to be retained after application losses in the form of ammonia by volatilization. For broadcast manure, plowed down within one day, use a delivered percentage of 95 (estimate for a wet soil in spring, between warm and cool temperatures).

Nitrogen to apply = Nitrogen anticipated from Step 5a (3) divided by the percent delivered in decimal form (from table 11-6):

$$N = \frac{176}{0.95} = 185 \text{ lb}$$

An additional 9 pounds of nitrogen is needed to compensate for application losses (volatilization).

The answer to question 2 would be:

$$N = 185 \text{ lb/ac}$$
$$P_2O_5 = 46$$
$$K_2O = 35$$

**Note:** Estimates for nitrogen additions to the field from soil organic matter, crop residue, atmospheric deposition, or legumes were not made.)

**Step 7. Select nutrient for calculation of manure application rates.**

To answer question 3, "How many acres are required to recycle nitrogen?" in this example, nitrogen is selected as the controlling nutrient.

**Step 8. Compute the acres on which manure can be applied to use the nutrients available.**

Required acres = Amount of PAN (from step 4) divided by the amount of selected nutrient for crop production (step 6)

Required acres:

$$\frac{14,311 \text{ lb N}}{185 \text{ lb N/ac}} = 77 \text{ ac}$$

This is the answer to question 3.

To answer question 4, "What area would be required to use the maximum nutrient utilization?" we must return to step 7.

**Step 7. Select nutrient for calculation of manure application rates.**

In this example potassium is both the nutrient that is used least by the crop and also produced in most abundance, so it will control if maximum utilization of nutrients is desired. In less obvious cases it may be necessary to go through step 8 to see which nutrient requires the most acres.

**Step 8. Compute the acres on which manure can be applied to use the nutrients available.**

Required acres = Amount of PAN (step 4) divided by the amount of selected nutrient for crop production.

$$K_2O = 21,281 \text{ lb } (\text{PAN})$$
$$K_2O = 35 \text{ lb/ac}$$

Required acres:

$$\frac{21,281 \text{ lb}}{35 \text{ lb/ac}} = 608 \text{ ac}$$

This is the answer to question 4.

Only 77 acres are needed to fully utilize the nitrogen, but 608 acres are required so that the potassium is not over applied.

**Step 9. Estimate application rate.**

The waste storage pond contains the manure produced by the 200 cows plus the milk parlor wastewater. Precipitation and evaporation must be considered to obtain the total volume of stored material. Chapter 10 discusses procedures to account for climatic conditions.

Manure excreted per day = 1.30 $ft^3$/da/1,000 lb cow (table 4–5).

Total manure volume per year:

$$\frac{200 \times 1,200 \times 1.3 \times 365}{1,000} = 113,880 \text{ ft}^3$$

Total wastewater volume per year:

$$\frac{200 \times 5 \times 365}{7.5} = 48,670 \text{ ft}^3$$

Volume of precipitation = Average annual rainfall – Average annual evaporation:

$$32 - 12 = 20 \text{ in. precipitation storage}$$

The 20 inches of precipitation translates to about 44,640 cubic feet. A waste storage pond with bottom dimensions of 60 by 200 feet, 2:1 side slopes, and 12 feet deep would have a maximum surface area of 26,784 square feet. The annual precipitation storage is:

$$20 \text{ in} \times 26,784 \text{ ft}^2 = 44,640 \text{ ft}^3$$

Total volume stored is:

$$113,880 + 48,670 + 44,640 = 207,190 \text{ ft}^3$$

Volume in acre-inches:

$$207,190 \text{ ft}^3 \times 12 \text{ in/ft} \times \frac{1 \text{ ac}}{43,560 \text{ ft}^2} = 57 \text{ ac} - \text{in}$$

Volume of water that has been added per cubic foot of manure is:

$$\frac{\left(48,670 \text{ ft}^3 + 44,640 \text{ ft}^3\right) \times 7.5}{113,880} = 6 \text{ gal/ft}^3$$

Total solids (TS) of manure as produced equals 12.5 percent (table 4–5). Resultant TS with wastewater and precipitation added equals 7 percent (fig. 11–2).

Calculate weight of stored material:

$$\frac{207,190 \text{ ft}^3 \times 60 \text{ lb/ft}^3}{2,000} = 6,216 \text{ tons}$$

From step 8, use application area of 77 acres for N utilization and 608 acres for maximum waste utilization. Application rate is calculated by dividing tons applied by the acres covered.

$$\frac{\text{Tons applied}}{\text{Application area}} = \text{Application rate (tons/acre)}$$

N accounting:

$$\frac{6,216 \text{ tons}}{77 \text{ ac}} = 81 \text{ tons/ac}$$

Maximum utilization:

$$\frac{6,216 \text{ tons}}{608 \text{ ac}} = 10 \text{ tons/ac}$$

This is the answer to question 5.

These application rates are almost equal to seven 3,000-gallon tank wagon loads (81 tons/acre) or less than one 3,000-gallon tank wagon loads (10 tons/acre) per acre. The application rate of 81 tons per acre is higher than normally encountered, but the waste is fairly dilute. Salinity and ground water effects should be monitored.

The following calculations demonstrate a method for adjusting waste applications to consider site characteristics.

**Application by tank wagon:**
Calculate the number of passes over the same ground by the 3,000-gallon tank wagon to distribute the waste material.

Travel distance of one pass is determined by field observation and verified by the producer to be 3,500 feet. Average width of application is determined to be 15 feet (outflow from tank is by gravity and varies with head in tank). Area of application in acres:

$$3,500 \times 15 = \frac{52,500 \text{ ft}^2}{43,560 \text{ ft}^2/\text{ac}} = 1.21 \text{ ac}$$

Application rate in one pass:

$$\frac{3{,}000 \text{ gal} \times 8.34 \text{ lb/gal}}{2{,}000 \text{ lb/ton} \times 1.21 \text{ ac}} = 10.3 \text{ tons/ac}$$

$$\# \text{ passes} = \frac{\text{application rate (total)}}{1 \text{ pass}}$$

$$= 10.3 \text{ tons/ac}$$

$$= \frac{81}{10.3}$$

$$= 7.9 \text{ passes (8 tank loads/3,500 ft run)}$$

The answer to question 6 is 8 passes per acre.

**Application by sprinkler:**
Starting at step 3, recompute the additional nitrogen required for sprinkler application losses. Nitrogen to apply = Nitrogen anticipated from Step 5a(3) divided by the percent delivered (from table 11–6):

$$N = \frac{176 \text{ lb/ac}}{0.75} = 235 \text{ lbs/ac}$$

$$P_2O_5 = 46 \text{ (no change)}$$

$$K_2O = 35 \text{ (no change)}$$

**Note:** Increased soil moisture from irrigation may increase soil losses by leaching and denitrification of nitrogen.

Returning to step 8, compute the acres required: Required acres = Amount of PAN (from step 4) divided by the Amount of nutrient per acre (step 6). Required acres:

$$\frac{14{,}311 \text{ lb}}{235 \text{ lb/ac}} = 61 \text{ ac}$$

Using the 61 acres of corn that has been established for application of waste materials, determine the application quantities for nitrogen control and assess adjustments needed for a phosphorus control design.

At design depth, a waste storage pond contains 57 acre-inches of waste material at about 7 percent of total solids (TS) (previously determined). To successfully irrigate material of this consistency through "ordinary" irrigation equipment, the TS should be no higher than 5 percent, preferably 4 percent (use 4%). To lower TS from 7 percent to 4 percent, water must be added at the rate given in figure 11–2. Compute mathematically as follows:

$$\frac{7.48 \times (7-4)}{4} = 5.6 \text{ gal/ft}^3 \text{ of waste}$$

**Note:** The quantity of water added to the manure causes the waste material to act essentially like water. It has in fact become wastewater.

Determine the total depth of application for nitrogen:

$$\text{Volume} = 57 \text{ ac-in} + \frac{5.6 \text{ gal/ft}^3 \times 207{,}190 \text{ ft}^3}{27{,}154 \text{ gal/ac-in}}$$

$$= 57 + 43$$

$$= 100 \text{ ac-in}$$

$$\text{Depth} = \frac{100 \text{ ac-in}}{61 \text{ ac}}$$

$$= 1.64 \text{ in}$$

This is the answer to the first part of question 7.

For ground water protection in sensitive aquifer areas, the 1.64 inches of wastewater application should be stored in the upper half of the root zone where most of the plant uptake occurs. Known from the example problem statement, the soils used to grow corn have an available water capacity of 5 inches in the top 60 inches of soil.

Normal irrigation design/operation techniques set 50 percent soil moisture depletion as the point at which irrigation operations are initiated.

$$5.0 \text{ in} \times 0.50 = 2.5 \text{ in}$$

Sprinkler irrigation efficiencies can be as low as 65 percent; therefore, the gross irrigation application would need to be increased to result in the soil receiving 1.64 inches of wastewater.

To assure that the leaching potential is minimized, the quantity (1.64 inches) can be split between two or three separate applications. Application rates in inches per hour must be set according to the intake rates established in local irrigation guides and adjusted for the soil texture and TS of the wastewater (tables 11–2 & 11–3).

**Phosphorus application:**
For crop growth, 46 pounds per acre $P_2O_5$ are needed, but 193 pounds per acre will be applied, which is about 4 times the amount needed. A continual application of phosphorus at this excessive rate may result in very high soil phosphorus availability. Phosphorus losses by runoff, erosion, and, in certain soil conditions, leaching can present a serious water quality concern. To limit irrigation application to the phosphorous requirement, the application quantity would need to be reduced to a fourth of 1.64 inches, or about 0.41 inches.

The answer to the second part of question 7 is 0.41 inches.

### (f) Adjustments for site characteristics

Land slope, soil surface texture, flooding potential, permeability, salinity, and soil depth all play a role in assessing pollution potential. This is particularly true where the preceding procedures are used to calculate the minimum area required to recycle nutrients based on nitrogen.

A procedure was developed in Oklahoma to consider site characteristics in assigning a pollution potential to any given field (Heidlage 1984). The procedure was used in one watershed, and after 4 years monitoring, no pollution from any of the farms studied was indicated (Watters 1984 and 1985).

The following soil properties and features were considered in selecting suitable sites for land application of wastes:

**Flooding** was considered the most important feature in Oklahoma because waste applied to flood prone soils can be readily transported into a watercourse.

**Rock fragments greater than 3 inches** affect the ease of tillage potential for waste incorporation and trafficability.

**Texture** primarily affects the trafficability of the soil and plant growth potential.

**Slope** affects the potential for runoff from the site.

**Depth** affects the thickness of the root zone, plant growth potential, and nutrient storage.

**Drainage** affects plant growth potential, the ease of travel or trafficability, tillage, nutrient conversion, and runoff potential.

**Yield** potential was an expression of the soil's ability to produce forage and, consequently, nutrient uptake.

In the Oklahoma procedure, a predominant or limiting soil is selected as being representative of the waste application site. Soil properties and site conditions are given a numerical rating, and these ratings are summed for the site. Heidlage weighted the numerical rating system so that those items, in his judgment, that could most contribute to potential surface water pollution were given more prominence.

The rating values were scaled so that the least degree of limitation imposed by the property or characteristic provides the highest value. The Oklahoma researchers recommended reducing or eliminating waste application on sites where the sum of the ratings fell below established levels. Where management or structural solutions are implemented to overcome the limiting factor(s), the limitation of the site is eliminated.

Similar reasoning to that done by Heidlage in Oklahoma can be used to factor soil and other site limitations into waste application strategies. Table 5–3 in chapter 5 lists several soil characteristics, degrees of limitation, and recommendations for overcoming limitations. This understanding of soil limitations at application sites and methodology for overcoming the limitations provide a tool for identifying components of a waste application plan and, in some cases, further planning needs.

For example, if the field(s) to receive manure is subject to frequent flooding, table 5–3 shows a severe site limitation and recommends wastes be applied during periods when flooding is unlikely. A waste application strategy would need to include a recognition of the periods when waste can be applied, and the waste storage component of the system would have to be adequately sized to provide storage between application opportunities. Other potential remedial actions might include waste injection to reduce opportunity for runoff of the manure during flood event and some form of structural measure to reduce flooding.

## (g) Rule-of-thumb estimates

Tables 11–10, 11–11, 11–12, and 11–13 can be used for rule-of-thumb estimates of available nutrients in different manure for the common methods of manure management. Field offices can develop additional tables for other livestock handling methods that are customary in their areas. Tables 11–10, 11–11, 11–12, and 11–13 are limited to:

- Solid and slurry manure applied in tons
- Available nutrients, first year only
- Situations where there is little carryover of nutrients from previous manure applications
- Common methods of manure management

Manure liquids are not included because manure of this type will be diluted 4 to 10 times so that it can be flushed into storage or treatment facilities. With this method of waste management, a large loss of nitrogen can occur during storage, and tests should be made to determine the nitrogen concentration.

The amounts shown in the tables are in pounds of available nutrients per ton. The estimated nutrients vary considerably according to the climate and waste management system. (Refer to table 11-9 for nutrient mineralization rates.) The tables also show the estimated moisture content, which can be used as a guide. The tons are the actual weight of the manure as it is applied, which includes moisture and bedding. Use reliable local data if they are available. In most cases, manure changes weight during storage and treatment because it almost always gains or loses moisture.

The manure from beef cattle on the Texas High Plains provides an example of moisture loss. Mathers (1972) found that the manure on 23 feedlots ranged from 20 to 54 percent moisture content, averaging 34 percent. This compares to fresh manure that has 86 percent moisture content and 14 percent TS. The lot manure has an average TS content of 66 percent. The manure had to dry considerably for the TS content to increase from 14 percent to 66 percent. If no loss of volatile solids occurred, the manure would have shrunk about five times. Because some loss of solids always occurs, the shrinkage is even greater. Stated another way—of 5 tons of manure excreted, only 1 ton remains on the lot, although most of the constituents, such as salt, are retained.

**Table 11–10** Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from dairy cows by management system

| Management system | Final moisture | Nutrients available first year N | $P_2O_5$ | $K_2O$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | ----- lb/ton ----- | | |
| 1. Fresh manure, collected and applied daily, incorporated before drying | 89 | 7 | 3 | 5 |
| 2. Manure collected daily, 50% processing water added, stored in covered tank, applied semi-annually, incorporated before drying | 92 | 3 | 3 | 5 |
| 3. Manure placed daily in open storage pond; 30% processing water added; liquids retained; spread annually in fall; incorporated before drying; cool, humid climate; evap. = precip | 92 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. Bedded manure, unroofed stacking facility (bedding is 10% by weight); spread in spring before drying; cool, humid climate; evap. = precip | 82 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| 5. Manure, no bedding, stored outside; leachate lost; spread in spring before drying; cool, humid climate | 87 | 3 | 2.5 | 4 |
| 6. Open lot storage—see beef cattle | | | | |

An example of moisture gain is seen in waste management for dairy cows in the northern part of the country. Typically, the manure is placed in storage daily in either a covered tank or an open storage pond. The milking center wastewater is added, which amounts to about 5 or 6 gal/cow/day (Zall 1972). If 5 gallons of washwater are added daily to the manure from a 1,400-pound cow, the volume is increased by about 35 percent. Similarly, if the original moisture content is 89 percent, it is increased to almost 92 percent. Consequently, it is then necessary to haul more than 13 tons of manure to the field for every 10 tons excreted if there is no drying or further dilution.

**Table 11–11** Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from feeder swine by management system

| Management system | Final moisture | Nutrients available first year N | $P_2O_5$ | $K_2O$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | ----- lb/ton ----- | | |
| 1. Fresh manure, collected and applied daily, no dilution or drying, incorporated before drying | 90 | 9 | 7 | 10 |
| 2. Covered storage tank, applied and incorporated before drying, diluted with 50 percent additional water | 93 | 4 | 6 | 6 |
| 3. Ventilated storage pit beneath slotted floors, diluted 1:1, emptied every 3 months, incorporated before drying | 95 | 2.5 | 3 | 5 |
| 4. Open lot storage, removed in spring; incorporated before drying; warm, humid climate | 80 | 6 | 10 | 12 |
| 5. Open lot storage, cleaned yearly and incorporated; hot, arid climate | 40 | 9 | 28 | 52 |

**Table 11–12** Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from broilers and layers by management system

| Management system | Final moisture | Nutrients available first year N | $P_2O_5$ | $K_2O$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | ----- lb/ton ----- | | |
| 1. Fresh manure, collected and applied daily, incorporated before drying | 75 | 27 | 21 | 15 |
| 2. Layer manure stored in shallow pit, cleaned every 3 months, incorporated before drying* | 65 | 25 | 27 | 23 |
| 3. Layer manure stored in fan ventilated deep pit; cleaned yearly and incorporated; cool, humid climate** | 50 | 23 | 45 | 42 |
| 4. Broiler manure on sawdust or shavings cleaned every 4 months and incorporated; warm humid climate* | 25 | 36 | 35 | 40 |

* Wilkinson 1974.
** Sobel 1976.

**Example 11–7:**
**Given:** Manure from a 50,000 layer operation in Georgia is stored in a shallow pit. The manure is spread every 6 months and plowed down. The land is used for silage corn. The recommended nutrient application rate is 150 pounds nitrogen per acre per year.

**Questions:**
1. What is the application rate using the rule-of-thumb tables?
2. What is needed to recycle the manure at this rate?

**Solution, question 1:**
From table 11–12, management system 2, about 25 pounds of nitrogen per ton of manure are available the first year per ton of manure applied.

$$\text{Rate} = \frac{150 \text{ lb N } (\text{State nutrient guide rate})}{25 \text{ lb N/ton}}$$
$$= 6 \text{ tons/ac}$$

**Solution, question 2:**
1. Calculate weight of manure produced (see table 4–14). Weight of layers = 50,000 birds x 4 pounds average weight = 200,000 pounds, or 200 1,000-pound units.

$$\text{Manure} = \frac{60.5 \text{ lb/da}}{1{,}000 \text{ lb}}$$
$$\text{Weight} = \frac{200 \times 60.5 \times 365 \text{ da/yr}}{2{,}000 \text{ lb/ton}}$$
$$= 2{,}210 \text{ ton/yr}$$

2. Calculate weight of manure applied since manure can change weight while in storage. From table 11–12, management systems 1 and 2, moisture content can be estimated as 75 percent (fresh) and 65 percent (applied). Thus, total solids content is 25 percent (fresh) and 35 percent (applied).

$$\text{Applied wt} = \frac{25\%}{35\%} = 0.71 \text{ of wt produced}$$
$$= 0.71 \times 2{,}210 \text{ ton}$$
$$= 1{,}570 \text{ ton/yr}$$

3. Calculate area required:

$$\text{Area} = \frac{1{,}570 \text{ ton/yr}}{6 \text{ ton/ac } (\text{from question 1})}$$
$$= 262 \text{ acres required}$$

**Table 11–13** Rule-of-thumb estimate of available nutrients in manure from feeder beef by management system

| Management system | Final moisture | Nutrients available first year N | $P_2O_5$ | $K_2O$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | % | ----- lb/ton ----- | | |
| 1. Fresh manure, collected and applied daily, incorporated before drying | 86 | 9 | 5 | 8 |
| 2. Manure collected daily, stored in covered tank, no dilution or drying, applied semi-annually, incorporated before drying | 86 | 7 | 6 | 8 |
| 3. Bedded manure pack under roof, cleaned in spring, incorporated before drying (bedding = 7.5% by wt) | 80 | 5 | 5 | 7 |
| 4. Open lot storage, cleaned in spring, incorporated before drying, cold humid climate | 70 | 7 | 9 | 14 |
| 5. Open lot storage, cleaned semi-annually and incorporated; warm semi-arid climate | 30 | 11 | 16 | 3 |
| 6. Open lot storage, cleaned bi-annually and incorporated; hot arid climate | 20 | 6 | 15 | 36 |

## 651.1106 References

Alexander, E.L., and G.A. Margheim. 1974. Personal communication with C.E. Fogg.

Azevedo, J., and P.R. Stout. 1974. Farm manure. An overview of their role in the agricultural environment, CA Agric. Exp. Sta. Man. 44.

Bundy, L.G. 1985. Understanding plant nutrients: soil and applied nitrogen. Univ. WI Coop. Ext. Serv. Bull. No. A2519.

Conn and Stumpf. 1972. Outlines of biochemistry, third edition. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.

Ghoshal, S. 1974. Fate fertilizer phosphorus under aerobic decomposition. Plant and Soil 40(3).

Hayes, W.A. 1977. Personal communication with R.A. Phillips. Based upon a number of SCS technical guides in central United States.

Heidlage, Robert F., and Lyle C. Shingleton. 1984. Soil potential for waste disposal. Soil Survey Horizons, vol. 25, no. 1.

Horsfield, B.C., R.Z. Wheaton, J.C. Nye, and J.V. Mannering. 1973. Irrigation for land application of animal waste ID-88. Coop. Ext. Serv., Purdue Univ., West Lafayette, IN.

Larsen, S., D. Gunary, and C.D. Sutton. 1965. The rate of immobilization of applied phosphate in relation to soil properties. J. Soil Sci. vol. 16, No. 1.

Mathers, A.C., B.A. Stewart, J.D. Thomas, and B.J. Blair. 1972. Effects of cattle feedlot manure on crop yields and soil condition. USDA SW Great Plains Res. Ctr. Tech. Report No. 11.

Meisinger, J.J., and G.W. Randall. 1991. Managing nitrogen for ground-water quality and farm profitability. *In* R.F. Follett, D.R. Keeney, and R.M. Cruse (eds.). Managing nitrogen for ground water quality and farm profitability. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer., Madison, WI.

Moore, J.A., and M.J. Gamroth. 1989. Calculating the fertilizer value of manure from livestock operations. OR State Univ. Ext. Serv., EC1094/rev. 1–89.

Nelson, Lewis B. 1975. Fertilizer for all-out food production. *In* Spec. Pub. No. 23, p. 24, Amer. Soc. Agron., Madison, WI.

Pratt, P.F., S. Davis, and R.G. Sharpless. 1976. A four-year field trial with animal manure. J. Agric. Sci., CA. Agric. Exp. Sta. 44(5), pp 113-125.

Shaffer, M.J., A.D. Halvorson, and F. Pierce. 1991. Nitrate leaching and economic analysis package: Model description and application. *In* R.F. Follett, D.R. Keeney, and R.M. Cruse (eds.). Managing nitrogen for ground water quality and farm profitability. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer., Madison, WI.

Sobel, A.T. 1976. The high-rise of manure management. Dep. Agric. Eng. Rep. AWM 76-01, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y.

Sweeten, John M. 1976. Dilution of feedlot runoff. MP-1297, TX A&M Univ., College Station, TX.

Wagner, R.E., and M.B. Jones. 1968. Fertilization of high yielding forage crops. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer.

Watters, Steven P., and Joseph P. Marak. 1984. 208 Task 1401, animal waste study. Final report to OK Pollution Control Coord. Board by OK State Dep. Agric., Plant Indus. Div.

Watters, Steven P., and Joseph P. Marak. 1985. Water quality impacts of animal waste management in a northeastern Oklahoma watershed. Proceed. Fifth intl. symp. on agric. wastes, Chicago, IL.

Wilkinson, S.R. 1974. Poultry manure: Waste or resource. Farmers and Consumer's Market Bulletin.

Williams, J.R., and D.E. Kissel. 1991. Water percolation: An indicator of N leaching potential in managing nitrogen for groundwater quality and farm profitability. Amer. Soc. Agron.

Willrich, R.L., D.O. Turner, and V.V. Volk. 1974. Manure application guidelines for the Pacific Northwest. Amer. Assoc. Agric. Eng. Paper 74-4061, St. Joseph, MI.

Zall, R.R. 1972. Characteristics of milking center waste effluent from New York dairy farms. J. Milk and Food Tech.