

**Sustainable use of sewage sludge as a source of nitrogen and
phosphorus in cropping systems**

by

Eyob Habte Tesfamariam

**Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the
degree PhD (Agric) Agronomy in the
Department of Plant Production and Soil Science
Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
University of Pretoria**

**Supervisor: Prof. J. G. Annandale
Co-supervisor: Dr. J. M. Steyn
Prof. R.J. Stirzaker**

01 Sep. 2009

DECLARATION

I the undersigned, declare that the thesis, which I hereby submit for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Pretoria, is my own work, except where acknowledged in the text, and has not previously been submitted by me for a degree at this or any other tertiary institution.

Eyob Habte Tesfamariam

1 Sep. 2009

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I must thank God, the alpha and omega of all creation. His words are my comfort in all aspects of my life. "He gives power to the weary; and to him with no vigour; He increases strength. Even the young shall faint and be weary, and the young men shall utterly fall; but those who wait on Jehovah shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; they shall walk and not faint (Isaiah 40:27-31).

Next I would like to thank my supervisor Prof. J.G. Annandale for his guidance, support, and encouragement. I am sincerely indebted to his organisation of funding through WRC, ERWAT and SASOL, without which this degree would have been but a dream.

I especially thank Dr JM Steyn, my co-supervisor, for his encouragement, guidance, and support to complete this study.

A special thanks goes to Prof. R.J. Stirzaker, my co-supervisor, for his encouragement, keen advice, and prompt responses despite distance barriers.

I would like to thank ERWAT, SASOL, and WRC for financial support without which this study would not have been carried out.

My thanks also goes to Dr N Benadé and Mr M. Van der Laan, for their patience when working with the N model. I thank Mr Adam and Ms Nina from ARC soil, water, and climate who helped us with chemical analysis of soil and plant samples. I greatly appreciate the personnel on the experimental farm who helped me with technical assistance, especially Mr L Nonyane for his indispensable effort in gathering field data. My thanks also go to fellow graduate students of the Department of Plant Production and Soil Science for their encouragement.

Finally, I would like to thank my parents, especially my father, who wished my success at any cost at his disposal, my mother, my brothers and sisters. I would like to say thanks a lot to my wife Aster for putting up with me for the past five years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	5
LIST OF TABLES	9
LIST OF FIGURES.....	17
LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	22
ABSTRACT.....	23
CHAPTER 1	26
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	26
REFERENCES	33
CHAPTER 2	37
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	37
2.1 Background information	37
2.2. Sewage sludge types, characteristics, and agricultural use.....	39
2.2.1 Sewage sludge types.....	39
2.2.2 Nitrogen and sewage sludge.....	42
2.2.3 Phosphorus and sewage sludge.....	48
2.2.4 Utilising sewage sludge on agricultural lands.....	50
2.2.5 Sludge application rates on agricultural lands.....	53
2.2.6 Classification of sludge for use on agricultural lands	56
2.2.7 Experiences with sewage sludge on cropping systems.....	61
2.3 Nitrogen modelling	66
2.3.1 Mineralization	69
2.3.2 Immobilization	73
2.3.3 Nitrification.....	74
2.3.4 Denitrification	77
2.3.5 Ammonia volatilization.....	79
2.3.6 Crop nitrogen uptake	81
2.4 Motivation for this study	82
REFERENCES	88



CHAPTER 3	108
MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	108
3.1 Field site description	108
3.2 Sludge characteristics.....	108
3.3 Field trial and treatments.....	110
3.3.1 Dryland maize and irrigated maize/oats rotation.....	110
3.3.2 Weeping lovegrass (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i>).....	114
3.3.3 Turfgrass (Kikuyu, <i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i> Hochst. ex Chiov.) ..	117
3.4 Rainfall and irrigation	118
3.4.1 Rainfall	118
3.4.2 Irrigation	118
3.5 Soil solution sampling and analyses	121
3.6 Plant sampling	122
3.6.1 Dryland and irrigated maize.....	122
3.6.2 Irrigated oats	123
3.6.3 Weeping lovegrass.....	123
3.6.4 Turfgrass.....	124
3.7 Soil sampling.....	125
3.7.1 Dryland maize and irrigated maize/oats rotation.....	126
3.7.2 Dryland pasture	126
3.7.3 Turfgrass.....	127
3.8 Plant and soil chemical analyses	128
3.9 Additional methods involved in turfgrass trial.....	129
3.9.1 Mowing and sod harvest	129
3.9.2 Soil loss through sod lifting.....	129
3.9.3 Turfgrass establishment rate.....	130
3.10 Model parameter description.....	130
3.10.1 Crop growth model.....	131
3.10.2 Nitrogen model	133
3.11 Statistical analyses	134
REFERENCES	135
CHAPTER 4	137
AGRONOMIC CROPS	137
4.1 Grain and forage yield.....	138
4.1.1 Grain yield	138
4.1.2 Forage yield.....	141
4.2 Crop N uptake	144
4.2.1 Grain N uptake.....	144
4.2.2 Forage N uptake.....	147
4.3 Soil profile total N mass balance, residual nitrate and ammonium, and nitrate leaching.....	153
4.3.1 Total N mass balance.....	153
4.3.2. Residual nitrate.....	157
4.3.3 Residual ammonium	158



4.3.4 Nitrate leaching.....	159
4.4 Total P mass balance and residual Bray-1P	162
4.4.1 Total P mass balance	162
4.4.2 Soil profile residual Bray-1 extractable P	166
4.5 Conclusions	170
REFERENCES	173

CHAPTER 5	178
PERENNIAL DRYLAND PASTURE - WEEPING LOVEGRASS (<i>Eragrostis curvula</i> L.)	178
5.1 Hay yield, crude protein content, and water use efficiency	179
5.1.1 Hay yield	179
5.1.2 Crude protein content	183
5.1.3 Effect of sludge application rate on rainfall use efficiency	186
5.2 Hay N uptake	189
5.3 Soil profile total N mass balance, nitrate leaching, residual nitrate and ammonium	193
5.3.1 Total N mass balance	193
5.3.2 Residual nitrate and nitrate leaching	197
5.3.3 Residual ammonium	199
5.4 Total P mass balance and residual Bray-1P	202
5.4.1 Total P mass balance	202
5.4.2 Soil profile residual Bray-1 extractable P	204
5.5 Conclusions	206
REFERENCES	209

CHAPTER 6	214
TURFGRASS	214
6.1 Turfgrass growth and quality	215
6.1.1 Establishment rate	215
6.1.2 Turfgrass colour	215
6.1.3 Sod integrity	218
6.2 Accumulation of N and P in soil below active root zone	219
6.2.1 Nitrogen	219
6.2.2 Phosphorus	224
6.3 Soil loss through sod harvesting	228
6.4 Nitrate and salt leaching	229
6.4.1 Nitrate leaching	230
6.4.2. Salt leaching	231
6.5 Conclusions	234
REFERENCES	237



CHAPTER 7	240
NITROGEN MODELLING	240
7.1 Model calibration.....	240
7.2 Model corroboration	244
7.2.1 Agronomic crops.....	245
7.2.2 Weeping lovegrass.....	250
7.3 Conclusions	259
REFERENCES	260
CHAPTER 8	261
CONCLUSIONS	261
REFERENCES	266
APPENDIX	267

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Effects of sewage sludge treatment processes on sludge properties and land application practices (Adapted from US EPA, 1984).....	41
Table 2.2 Estimates of nitrogen mineralization for various sludge treatment methods in the year of application (percent of initial organic N) (adapted from Henry et al., 1999).....	45
Table 2.3 Nitrogen mineralization rate estimate ranges for all types of sludge for years following the application year (percent of the remaining organic N) (adapted from Henry et al., 1999).....	45
Table 2.4 Ammonia volatilization rates from Northwest Biosolids applied in western Washington (maritime climate) (adapted from Henry et al., 1999).	47
Table 2.5 Suggested denitrification values for sludges applied to agricultural lands in the Pacific Northwest, USA (adapted from Henry et al., 1999).	48
Table 2.6 Annual sewage sludge produced and the percentage applied to agricultural lands for 15 European Countries and USA. (USA and EU (AEA Technology Environment, 2002); Australia (Priestley, 1991); South Africa (Lötter and Pitman, 1997))	51
Table 2.7 A few of the pathogens that could potentially be present in municipal sewage sludge and the diseases or symptoms they cause (adapted from U.S. EPA, 1995).	57

Table 2.8 South African preliminary classification: microbiological class (Snyman and Herselman, 2006) compared with the USA (US EPA, 1995); (US EPA, 2003).	58
Table 2.9 South African preliminary classification: pollutant class (Snyman and Herselman, 2006) compared with the US land application pollutant limits (US EPA, 1995) and proposed EU maximum permissible limits in sludge in mg kg ⁻¹ (IC Consultants, 2001).....	59
Table 2.10 South African preliminary classification: Stability class (Snyman and Herselman, 2006).....	60
Table 2.11 Permissible utilisation of sludge in agricultural applications based on the South African sludge classification system (adapted from Snyman and Herselman, 2006)	61
Table 3.1 Chemical characteristics of anaerobically digested, paddy dried sludge used during the 2004/05 – 2007/08 growing seasons (source Vlakplaats wastewater treatment plant)	109
Table 3.2 Inorganic fertilizer application timing and type of fertilizer applied to dryland maize, irrigated maize, and irrigated oats during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons at ERWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.	113
Table 3.3 Planting and harvesting dates for dryland maize, irrigated maize, and irrigated oats experiment conducted during the 2004/05-2007/08 growing seasons at ERAWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.....	114

Table 3.4 Sludge applications and hay cutting dates for Weeping lovegrass during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons at ERWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.....	116
Table 3.5 Type of fertilizer applied and application timing for a weeping lovegrass experiment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons at ERWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.....	116
Table 3.6 Monthly rainfall distributions during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons at ERWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.....	120
Table 4.1 Dryland maize grain yield response to three sludge application rates, a control, and an inorganic fertilizer treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing season.	138
Table 4.2 Irrigated maize-oat rotation grain yield response to three sludge application rates, a control, and an inorganic fertilizer treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	140
Table 4.3 Dryland maize forage yield response to three sludge application rates, a control, and an inorganic fertilizer treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	142
Table 4.4 Irrigated maize-oat rotation forage yield response to three sludge application rates, a control, and an inorganic fertilizer treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	143
Table 4.5 Dryland maize grain N uptake from a clay loam soil treated with three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	145

Table 4.6 Irrigated maize-oat rotation grain N uptake from a clay loam soil treated with three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control during the 2004 to 2007/08 growing seasons.	146
Table 4.7 Dryland maize forage N uptake from a clay loam soil treated with three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.	147
Table 4.8 Irrigated maize-oat rotation forage N uptake from a clay loam soil treated with three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.	149
Table 4.9 Cumulative grain and forage N uptake by dryland maize and irrigated maize oat rotation during the 2004-2008 study period.	152
Table 4.10 Cumulative N mass balances (N supply less uptake) of dryland maize and irrigated maize-oat rotation for the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.	154
Table 4.11 Cumulative N applied less forage N uptake, soil profile N change in storage and mass balance difference between the supply less forage uptake and change in storage for the 2004/05 to 2006/07 growing seasons.	156
Table 4.12 Residual nitrate mass after crop harvest in the top 0.6 m soil stratum of dryland maize and irrigated maize-oat rotation during the 2004/05 to 2006/07 growing seasons.	158

Table 4.13 Residual ammonium mass after crop harvest in the top 0.6 m soil profile of dryland maize and irrigated maize-oat rotation during the 2004/05 to 2006/07 growing seasons.....	159
Table 4.14 Cumulative P mass balances (supply less forage uptake) of dryland maize and irrigated maize-oat rotation during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	163
Table 4.15 Cumulative soil profile P change in storage and mass balance difference between the supply less forage uptake mass balance and change in storage.....	165
Table 4.16 Residual Bray-1P mass after crop harvest in the top 0.6 m soil profile of dryland maize and irrigated maize-oat rotation during the 2004/05 to 2006/07 growing seasons.....	167
Table 4.17 Cumulative P applied, total plant available P, normalized plant available P, and the percentage of Bray-1P in contrast to the total P applied during the 2004/05 to 2006/07 growing seasons.	169
Table 5.1 Annual hay yield of weeping lovegrass as affected by three sludge application rates, inorganic fertilizer, and control.....	179
Table 5.2 Weeping lovegrass hay yield per cut of three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	181
Table 5.3 Crude protein content of weeping lovegrass as affected by three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer treatment, and a control.....	185

Table 5.4 Annual rainfall use efficiency of weeping lovegrass as affected by three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control.	187
Table 5.5 Rainfall use efficiency of weeping lovegrass per cut as affected by three sludge application rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control.	188
Table 5.6 Annual weeping lovegrass N uptake from three sludge application rates, inorganic fertilizer treatment, and a control during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	189
Table 5.7 Weeping lovegrass hay N uptake per cut from three sludge application rates, inorganic fertilizer treatment, and a control.....	190
Table 5.8 Cumulative N supply (CUM NS)), uptake (CUM NU), and mass balance of a weeping lovegrass treated with three sludge application rates, inorganic fertilizer, and a control.....	194
Table 5.9 Residual nitrate mass in the top 0.5 m soil stratum of weeping lovegrass plots treated with three sludge rates, an inorganic fertilizer, and a control treatment.....	197
Table 5.10 Residual ammonium mass in the top 0.5 m soil stratum after every second weeping lovegrass hay cut during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	200
Table 5.11 Cumulative total P supply (CUM-PS), uptake (CUM-PU), and mass balance of a weeping lovegrass treated with three sludge rates, inorganic fertilizer, and a control.....	202

Table 5.12 Residual Bray-1P in the top 0.5 m soil stratum after the second hay cut of dryland pasture (weeping lovegrass) during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	206
Table 6.1 Kikuyu (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i> Hochst. ex Chiov.) turfgrass sod quality (establishment rates (% mean vegetative cover), visual colour ratings, and sod integrity) as affected by five sludge application rates during the 2005 and 2006 growing seasons at East Rand Water Care Works, Johannesburg, South Africa.	216
Table 6.2. Total N imported with sludge, vs. exported with sods and clippings during the 2004/05 and 2005/06 growing seasons at East Rand Water Care Works, Johannesburg, South Africa.....	221
Table 6.3 Total nitrogen and total phosphorus mass balances after two years of sludge application and sod harvest events for five sludge application rates during the 2005 and 2006 growing seasons	222
Table 6.4 Total phosphorus imported with sludge, vs. exported with sods and clippings during the 2005 and 2006 growing seasons at East Rand Water Care Works, Johannesburg, South Africa.	225
Table 6.5. Sod mass and cumulative soil thickness exported with turfgrass sods as affected by five sludge application rates after two consecutive sludge application and sod harvest events at East Rand Water Care Works, Johannesburg, South Africa.	229
Table 7.1 Model evaluation statistical parameters with their reliability criteria (after De Jager, 1994)	241

Table 7.2 Statistical parameters of the SWB model calibration simulations for maize, oats, and weeping lovegrass during the 2004/05 growing season.....	244
Table 7.3 Statistical parameters of the SWB model corroboration for maize, oats, and weeping lovegrass using combined data collected during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	246
Table 7.4 Statistical parameters of the SWB model corroboration for weeping lovegrass without and with updating soil water content after every hay cut using combined data collected during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	250
Table A1 Selected macro nutrients and heavy metals supplied from three sludge rates to dryland maize, irrigated maize-oat rotation and dryland pasture during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons	268
Table A2 Selected macro nutrients and heavy metals supplied from three sludge rates to turfgrass sod production during the 2004/05 to 2005/06 growing seasons.....	269
Table A3 Statistical parameters of the SWB model corroboration for weeping lovegrass (Soil water content updated after every hay cut) using combined data collected during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons.....	270

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1 Simplified nitrogen cycle in terrestrial plant-soil system.....	43
Figure 2.2 Nitrogen requirement of maize during the growing season and nitrogen availability from fertilizer compared with sludge (adapted from Muse et al., 1991).....	52
Figure 4.1 Three year cumulative mean N uptake by the 16 Mg ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹ sludge treated irrigated maize-oat rotation and dryland maize (bars) versus total N supply from sludge 8 Mg ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹ (former norm) and 10 Mg ha ⁻¹ yr ⁻¹ (current norm) with variable N contents (2.56% mean value in his study vs. 3.85% South African sludge mean value (Snyman and Herselman, 2006)).	151
Figure 4.2 Soil profile total N content at the beginning of the study before treatment application (initial) and at the end of three years of study (2006/07).....	155
Figure 4.3 Nitrate concentration of leachate collected from 0.3 m (a) and 0.6 m (b) depth wetting front detectors in an irrigated maize-oat rotation during the 2006/07 growing season (arrows indicate inorganic fertilizer application events).....	161
Figure 4.4 Soil profile initial total P content in contrast to P content change following three years of study with three sludge application rates, inorganic fertilizer treatment, and a control (zero sludge and inorganic fertilizer applied).....	164

Figure 5.1 Rainfall distribution during the first and second cuts of weeping lovegrass planted during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 growing seasons, at ERWAT, Ekurhuleni district, South Africa.....	182
Figure 5.2 Weeping lovegrass hay yield as affected by rainfall amount and sludge application rate.....	183
Figure 5.3 Sludge application rate to satisfy four year mean weeping lovegrass N demand (247 kg N ha^{-1}) as affected by sludge N content and N carry over effects.....	192
Figure 5.4 Initial soil profile total N and after four years of study with three sludge rates ($4, 8, \text{ and } 16 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), an inorganic fertilizer ($200 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1} \text{ yr}^{-1}$), and a control.....	196
Figure 5.5 Residual nitrate before treatment application (initial) and after four consecutive years of treatment application (three sludge rates, inorganic fertilizer and control).....	198
Figure 5.6 Initial soil profile total P and after four consecutive years of treatment applications in a weeping lovegrass hay production trial.	203
Figure 6.1 Concentration of nitrate in soil solution samples collected from wetting front detectors installed at 0.30 m of a turfgrass sod (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>) trial for four sludge application rates ($0 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}, 8 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}, 33 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}, \text{ and } 100 \text{ Mg ha}^{-1}$) during (a) year 2005 and (b) 2006.	217
Figure 6.2 Soil profile (a) total N (b) nitrate (c) ammonium (d) total P (e) Bray-1 extractable P, and (f) electrical conductivity (ECe) as affected by two consecutive years of sludge application at five rates (0, 8, 33, 67, and	

100 Mg ha ⁻¹) in a turfgrass sod (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>) field trial, sampled before treatment application in 2005 (initial) and after two sod harvests in 2006.	223
Figure 6.3 Soil profile (a) total P (b) Bray-1 extractable P as affected by two consecutive years of sludge application at five rates (0, 8, 33, 67, and 100 Mg ha ⁻¹) in a turfgrass sod (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>) field trial, sampled before treatment application in 2005 (initial) and after two sod harvests in 2006.	226
Figure 6.4 Electrical conductivity of soil solution samples collected from wetting front detectors installed at 0.30 m of a turfgrass sod (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>) trial for four sludge application rates (0 Mg ha ⁻¹ , 8 Mg ha ⁻¹ , 33 Mg ha ⁻¹ , and 100 Mg ha ⁻¹) during (a) year 2004/05 and (b) 2005/06 growing seasons.....	233
Figure 6.5 Soil profile electrical conductivity as affected by two consecutive years of sludge application at five rates (0, 8, 33, 67, and 100 Mg ha ⁻¹) in a turfgrass sod (<i>Pennisetum clandestinum</i>) field trial, sampled before treatment application in 2004/05 (initial) and after two sod harvests in 2005/06.....	234
Figure 7.1 Simulated (solid lines) and measure values (symbols with standard deviation) from top to bottom of leaf area index, aboveground biomass (TDM), and aboveground biomass N uptake for the 16 Mg ha ⁻¹ sludge treatment.....	243

Figure 7.2 Simulated (solid lines) and measure values (symbols) of leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (TDM), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 8 Mg ha⁻¹ per annum sludge treated dryland maize during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period.247

Figure 7.3 Simulated (solid lines) and measure values (symbols) of leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (TDM), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 8 Mg ha⁻¹ per annum sludge treated irrigated maize(1)-oat(2) rotation during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period.248

Figure 7.4 Simulated (solid lines) and measure values (symbols) of leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (TDM), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 16 Mg ha⁻¹ per annum sludge treated irrigated maize(1)-oat(2) rotation during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period.249

Figure 7.5 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the control treatment (0 nutrients applied) during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period (without updating soil water).253

Figure 7.6 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 8 Mg ha⁻¹

yr⁻¹ sludge treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period
(without updating soil water). 254

Figure 7.7 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 16 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ sludge treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period (without updating soil water). 255

Figure 7.8 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the control treatment (0 nutrients applied) during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period (without updating soil water). 256

Figure 7.9 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 8 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ sludge treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period (without updating soil water). 257

Figure 7.10 Simulated (solid lines) and measured values (symbols with standard deviation) of weeping lovegrass leaf area index (a), aboveground biomass (b), and aboveground biomass N uptake (c) for the 16 Mg ha⁻¹ yr⁻¹ sludge treatment during the 2004/05 to 2007/08 study period (without updating soil water). 258

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Al	Aluminium
As	Arsenic
Cd	Cadmium
Cr	Chromium
Cu	Copper
CFU	colony forming units
ERWAT	East Rand Water Care Works
EU	European Union
Fe	Iron
FeO	Iron oxide
Hg	Mercury
LAI	Leaf area index ($m^2 m^{-2}$)
MAE	Mean absolute error
M1-P	Mehlick-1 extractable phosphorus
M3-P	Mehlick-3 extractable phosphorus
N	Nitrogen
P	Phosphorus
Ni	Nickel
NO ₃	Nitrate
NH ₄	Ammonium
Pb	Lead
PFU	plaque-forming units
r ²	Coefficient of determination
Se	Selenium
US EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
WUE	Water use efficiency ($kg ha^{-1} mm^{-1}$)
Zn	Zinc

ABSTRACT

Municipal sewage sludge is used as source of plant nutrients world wide for agriculture. However, many countries do not make full use of this opportunity. A lack of local knowledge about the benefits and disadvantages of sludge contributes to this low utilisation. For instance, only 28% of the sludge produced in South Africa is beneficially utilized on agricultural lands. The overall objectives of this study were 1) to determine responsible sludge loading rates for a range of cropping systems 2) to investigate the agronomic benefits and sustainability of using municipal sludge according to crop N demand, and 3) to develop a tool to enable extrapolation of these results to other regions (soils, climates) and other cropping systems. Field experiments were conducted on a wide range of cropping systems including dryland maize, irrigated maize-oat rotation, dryland pasture, and turfgrass sod production. An 8 Mg ha⁻¹ control (South African old annual upper limit norm) was compared with sludge rates of 0, 4, and 16 Mg ha⁻¹ for the agronomic crops and dryland pasture. Under the turfgrass sod production, the aim was to export large volumes of sludge with the sod without compromising the environment. Therefore, an 8 Mg ha⁻¹ control treatment was compared with sludge rates of 33, 67, and 100 Mg ha⁻¹ which are equivalent to depths of 5, 10, and 15 mm sludge, respectively. Doubling of the old annual upper limit significantly increased grain and forage yield of both the dryland maize and the irrigated maize-oat rotation. This rate also improved weeping lovegrass hay yield, water use efficiency and crude protein content. Residual nitrate in the soil profile after harvest, and solution samples collected from wetting front detectors were

used as indicators of groundwater pollution through nitrate leaching in the medium term. For the irrigated maize-oat rotation and dryland pasture, a low leaching risk was indicated even at high sludge loading rates of 16 Mg ha⁻¹ in this clay loam soil. In contrast, residual nitrate for similar sludge rates under dryland maize cropping did reveal the potential for pollution through leaching. Sludge loading at all rates resulted in the accumulation of total P and loading rates of 16 Mg ha⁻¹ increased Bray-1P in all agronomic and pasture cropping systems. In the case of turfgrass for sod production, sludge loading rates up to 67 Mg ha⁻¹ significantly improved turfgrass establishment rate and colour. The ability of sods to remain intact during handling and transportation improved as the sludge loading rate increased to 33 Mg ha⁻¹, but deteriorated at higher rates. A sludge loading rate of 100 Mg ha⁻¹ was needed to eliminate soil loss at harvest, but this rate was associated with unacceptably high N leaching losses and poor sod strength. The variation in sludge quality, crop nutrient removal across a range of cropping systems, and seasons indicates that a dynamic, mechanistic decision support tool is needed to estimate responsible sludge loading rates. A mechanistic N module was adapted and incorporated into an existing soil water balance/crop growth model (SWB). The model was calibrated with statistically acceptable accuracy for dryland maize, irrigated maize-oat rotation, and dryland pasture. The model was tested against independent data sets and was able to predict the measured variables of interest with acceptable accuracy for dryland maize, irrigated maize and oats. For dryland pasture, the model predicted similar variables of interest with lower accuracy for medium-term simulations, but this

improved with updating the profile water content after every hay cut. The ideal sludge loading rate to satisfy crop N demand is dynamic and should be adjusted according to cropping systems, seasonal rainfall variability, sludge N concentration, and sludge application strategy (N or P based). The ultimate cumulative sludge loading of an area will depend on the accumulation of total and Bray-1P, and the risk this poses for pollution, as long as the risk from other pollutants remains minimal. The SWB model shows promise as a decision support tool for sludge management in agricultural lands.