



Provided by the author(s) and University of Galway in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite the published version when available.

Title	Effect of rainfall interval on runoff losses of biosolids and meat and bone meal when applied to a grassland soil
Author(s)	Lucid, Joseph D.; Healy, Mark G.
Publication Date	2014
Publication Information	Lucid, J.D., Fenton, O., Grant, J., Healy, M.G. (2014) 'Effect of rainfall interval on runoff losses of biosolids and meat and bone meal when applied to a grassland soil'. Water Air And Soil Pollution, 225 (8).
Publisher	Springer
Link to publisher's version	http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11270-014-2042-6
Item record	http://hdl.handle.net/10379/4455
DOI	http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11270-014-2042-6

Downloaded 2024-03-20T10:18:24Z

Some rights reserved. For more information, please see the item record link above.



1 Published as: Lucid, J.D., Fenton, O., Grant, J., Healy, M.G. 2014. Effect of rainfall interval on
2 runoff losses of biosolids and meat and bone meal when applied to a grassland soil. *Water, Air and*
3 *Soil Pollution* 225(8): 2042. DOI 10.1007/s11270-014-2042-6

4
5 **Effect of rainfall time interval on runoff losses of biosolids and meat and**
6 **bone meal when applied to a grassland soil**

7 Joseph D. Lucid¹, Owen Fenton^{2*}, Jim Grant³, Mark G. Healy¹

8
9 ¹Civil Engineering, National University of Ireland, Galway, Co. Galway, Rep. of Ireland.

10 ²Teagasc, Johnstown Castle, Environmental Research Centre, Co Wexford, Rep. of Ireland

11 ³ Teagasc, Ashtown, Dublin 15, Co. Dublin, Rep. of Ireland.

12 *Corresponding author. Tel: +353 53 9171271. E-mail address: owen.fenton@teagasc.ie

13
14 **Abstract**

15 This study assessed runoff losses following laboratory rainfall simulation on a grassland soil
16 at two time intervals (48 and 216 h) after a single application of biosolids and meat and bone
17 meal (MBM). The treatments were: a soil-only control, three types of biosolids (lime-
18 stabilised (LS), thermally dried (TD) and anaerobically digested (AD)) and two types of
19 MBM (low ash and high ash content) all applied at two rates (the maximum and double the
20 maximum legal application rate currently permitted in Ireland). Results showed that
21 treatment, time interval and their interactions all had significant effects on dissolved reactive
22 P (DRP), total P (TP) and total dissolved P (TDP) concentrations. Time interval had the
23 greatest effect for DRP and TP concentrations, while treatment was more significant for TDP.
24 All treatments released DRP concentrations in excess of 30 µg DRP L⁻¹. Anaerobically
25 digested biosolids released the least amount of DRP into surface runoff for both application

rates at both time intervals. Low ash-content MBM, applied at the maximum legal rate, released the most DRP at both time intervals, and the TD biosolids released the most DRP when applied at double the maximum rate. Lime-stabilised biosolids released the most TP in runoff at both application rates. Runoff comprised > 50% particulate P for all treatments. Besides TD biosolids, all treatments, applied at both rates, released lower concentrations of suspended solids (SS) during the second time interval than the first. Soil-specific effects were also evident; although the soil was non-calcareous and had a low pH and high amounts of available aluminium and iron, high organic matter ensured low levels of P adsorption.

Keywords: biosolids, meat and bone meal, phosphorus, agriculture, runoff

1. Introduction

Biosolids, derived from the wastewater treatment process, and meat and bone meal (MBM), the by-products of the rendering industry, may be used as agricultural fertilisers, as they contain organic matter (OM) and inorganic elements (Ylivainio et al., 2008). When spread on tilled land or grassland, they supply nutrients and metals required for plant and crop growth, and may also be used as an aid in the development of a soil's physical and chemical characteristics (Meyer et al., 2001; Mondini et al., 2008). A large amount of sewage sludge and MBM are produced in Europe. Annual production of MBM in Ireland peaked in 2003 (150,000 tonnes p.a.; Inter Departmental/Agency Committee on Disposal Options for MBM, 2003), but declined due to a decrease in herd sizes (SEI, 2004). Quantities of sewage sludge produced at urban waste water treatment plants in 2009 was approximately 106,000 tonnes, with 62% (down from 70% in 2007) of this being reused on agricultural land (EPA, 2012). The drive to reuse sewage sludge has been accelerated by the Landfill Directive, 1999/31/EC (European Commission (EC), 1999) and the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC; EC,

2009), which places an increased emphasis on the production of biomass-derived energy. One such means of reuse is landspreading, although potential hazards associated with their application to land, such as excessive nutrient release, needs to be evaluated.

To dispose of treated sewage sludge (biosolids) in Ireland, farmers must abide by the European Union (EU) **(Good Agricultural Practice for Protection of Waters) Regulations 2014 (Statutory Instrument (SI) 31 of 2014)**. Compliance with the regulations requires protection of waters against pollution from agricultural sources and management of manures and fertilisers. In addition, the application of biosolids to agricultural land is governed in Europe by EU Directive 86/278/EEC (EEC, 1986), and within Ireland, is enacted by the “Codes of Good Practice for the Use of Biosolids in Agriculture” (Fehily Timoney and Company, 1999).

The handling (and disposal) of MBM is subject to strict enforcement in many European states. For example, in Ireland, S.I. 551 of 2002 requires possession of a licence for the manufacture, sale or supply of MBM. In addition, strict guidelines govern its reuse as a bioenergy resource (SEI, 2004). Land application of various categories of MBM is permitted within the EU member states, provided certain criteria are adhered to (EC, 2002; EC, 2006). These criteria include handling and processing procedures, and the prevention of land application of fertilisers consisting of Category 1 MBM. However, EC Regulation No. 181 of 2006 (EC, 2006) provides for stricter national rules to be implemented by each individual member state (EC, 2000), and this has resulted in the prohibition of the land application of organic fertilisers composed of Category 2 and 3 MBM materials in certain member states (for example, the Republic of Ireland has banned the land application of MBM under S.I. No. 253 of 2008).

76

77 In the EU, land application of biosolids and MBM are typically based on their nutrient and
78 metal contents. This approach results in phosphorus (P) becoming the limiting factor in
79 determining the application rates. This is in contrast to the United States (US), where
80 biosolids are applied based on their nitrogen (N) content (US EPA, 1993). Such a discrepancy
81 means that land application rates of biosolids in the US tend to be far greater than the EU,
82 resulting in less land required for the application of biosolids – but potentially greater
83 environmental losses.

84

85 Phosphorus losses to a surface waterbody originate from either the soil (chronic) or in runoff
86 where a storm event follows land application of fertilizer (incidental sources) (Brennan et al.,
87 2012). Such losses to a surface waterbody occur *via* direct discharges, surface and near
88 surface pathways, and/or groundwater discharge. Where there is a hydrological continuum
89 between a nutrient source (chronic or incidental) and surface water receptor, dissolved
90 reactive phosphorus (DRP) and particulate P (PP) can be delivered to a receptor and, where
91 loads are significant, may adversely affect water quality (Wall et al., 2011). Biosolids and
92 MBM application to soils may also contribute to soil test phosphorus (STP) build-up in soils,
93 thereby contributing to chronic losses of P, metal and pathogen losses in runoff (Gerba and
94 Smith, 2005). Dissolved reactive P losses may also be leached from an agricultural system to
95 shallow groundwater (Galbally et al., 2013) and, where a connectivity exists, may affect
96 surface water quality for long periods of time (Domagalski and Johnson, 2011; Fenton et al.,
97 2011).

98

99 Issues surrounding the potential ‘edge-of-field’ nutrient concentration and load losses arising
100 from land application of biosolids and MBM may be effectively investigated using low-cost

laboratory rainfall simulation studies, as they provide for more control over the variability of the soils' physical and chemical characteristics and surface slope, and allow comparison to be made between treatments (Regan et al., 2010).

The aims of this study were to determine chronic (study control) and incidental flow weighted mean concentrations (FWMCs) and loads (mass release) of DRP, PP, total dissolved phosphorus (TDP), total phosphorus (TP) and suspended solids (SS) in runoff from a grassland soil following application of three types of biosolids (lime-stabilised (LS), thermally dried (TD) and anaerobically digested (AD)) and two types of MBM (low ash and high ash content) applied at two rates (the maximum and double the maximum legal application rate currently permitted in Ireland) over two successive rainfall events (at the 48-h period outlined in S.I. 31 of 2014 and after 216 h) to see the lasting effects of potential losses of 11 mm h⁻¹-intensity rainfall events.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Biosolids and MBM characterisation

Three types of biosolids – AD, TD and LS - were collected from three wastewater treatment plants in Ireland. Two types of MBM, one with low ash (MBM LA) and one with high ash (MBM HA), were collected from a slaughterhouse in Co. Mayo, Ireland. **All results with respect to the characterisation of biosolids and MBM were presented previously in Lucid et al. (2013). Briefly, AD, TD, and LS biosolids, and MBM (high ash) and MBM (low ash) had total P (mg kg⁻¹) contents of 6916, 7600, 6332, 27.9 and 31.1, respectively, and AD, TD and LS biosolids, and MBM (high ash) and MBM (low ash) had total N (mg kg⁻¹) contents of 6.8, 30.8, 3.1, 39.7, and 59.1, respectively. Metal content and release was presented in Lucid et al. (2013).**

126

127 **2.2 Soil Collection and Analysis**

128 The soil used in this study was collected from a grassland field in Co. Galway, Ireland (ITM
129 reference 528060, 727322) **and was from the same site as in Lucid et al. (2013)**. Intact soil
130 sods measuring 0.7 m in length, 0.4 m in width and 0.1 m in depth, were collected from site
131 for use in the rainfall simulation study. A separate set of soil samples ($n = 3$), 0.1 m in depth
132 and 0.1 m in diameter, were collected from the same site for classification studies. A 2:1 ratio
133 of deionised water-to-soil was used to determine the soil pH. The soil samples were then air
134 dried at 40°C for 72 h, crushed to pass a 2-mm sieve and analysed for Morgan's P (Pm; the
135 national test used for the determination of plant available P in Ireland) using Morgan's
136 extracting solution after Morgan (1941). To determine the particle size distribution (PSD) of
137 the soil, a sieving and pipette technique was used (BSI, 1990b). The OM of the soil was
138 determined by LOI after BSI (1990a). **Soil characteristics are presented in Table 1.**

139

140 **2.3 Phosphorus desorption study and rainfall simulator test**

141

142 A P desorption study was conducted on each of the five media used in this study to determine
143 the time over which DRP may be released to surface water. This involved placing 6 g of
144 either biosolids or MBM into 120-ml-capacity plastic cups, overlaying them with 100 ml of
145 distilled water, sealing the containers, and placing them into an end-over-end shaker for a
146 period of 24 h. All tests were carried out in triplicate ($n=3$). At time intervals of 1, 4, 8, and
147 24 h, 2.5 ml of water was removed, filtered through 0.45- μm filters, and stored at 4°C until
148 testing (normally conducted within 1 d of collection). The water samples were tested for DRP
149 in accordance with the standard methods (APHA, 1995) by a nutrient analyser (Konelab 20,
150 Thermo Clinical Labsystems, Finland).

151

152 The following treatments were examined in a laboratory rainfall simulator (n=3): grassed
153 soil-only treatment (the study control) and grassland onto which either TD, LS and AD
154 biosolids, or MBM HA and MBM LA were spread. Each type of biosolids and MBM was
155 applied to the soil at two different rates based on a soil with a P Index of 1 (after Lucid et al.,
156 2013; Table 2): the maximum legal application rate and double the maximum legal
157 application rate.

158

159 Laboratory runoff boxes, 0.1 m-long, 0.225 m-wide and 0.075 m-deep and inclined at a 5-
160 degree slope and with the side-walls 0.025 m higher than the grassed sods, were used in this
161 experiment. Each runoff box had 0.005-m-diameter drainage holes, located at 0.3-m-centres
162 in the base, after Regan et al. (2010) and Brennan et al. (2011), to allow for drainage of water
163 at the base. Muslin cloth was placed at the base of each runoff box, covering these drainage
164 holes, before packing the soil in order to prevent soil loss. Immediately prior to the start of
165 each experiment, the soil sods were trimmed and packed into the runoff boxes. The runoff
166 boxes were then positioned under the rainfall simulator. The rainfall simulator consisted of a
167 single 1/4HH-SS14SQW nozzle (Spraying Systems Co., Wheaton, IL) attached to a 4.5-m-
168 high metal frame. The rainfall simulator was calibrated to achieve an intensity of 10.85 ± 0.14
169 mm h^{-1} with a droplet impact energy of $260 \text{ kJ mm}^{-1} \text{ ha}^{-1}$ at 86% uniformity after Regan et al.
170 (2010) and Brennan et al. (2011). The source of the water that was used for the rainfall
171 simulations was potable tap water, which had a DRP concentration of less than 0.005 mg L^{-1} ,
172 a pH of 7.73 ± 0.2 and an electrical conductivity (EC) of 0.494 dS m^{-1} .

173

174 The packed sods were then saturated using a rotating disc, variable-intensity rainfall
175 simulator (after Williams et al., 1997), and left to drain for 24 h by opening the 5-mm-

diameter drainage holes at the base of the runoff box before continuing with the experiment. After this time elapsed, the grassed sods were assumed to be at field capacity (after Regan et al., 2010). The biosolids and MBM were spread over the surface of the sods and the drainage holes were sealed for the remainder of the experiment. In accordance with S.I. No. 31 of 2014, the laboratory runoff boxes were then left in this state for a period of 48 h. The first rainfall event (RE 1) was applied at $t = 48$ h (after the application of the treatments). To investigate the breakdown, if any, of the treatments with time and the lasting effects that this may have on surface runoff, the second rainfall event (RE 2) occurred at $t = 216$ h (on the same sod).

Rainfall was applied to each runoff box until consistent, continuous droplets of water flowed from the runoff box; once this state had been achieved, each rainfall event lasted for a 30-min duration. Surface runoff samples for each event were collected in 5-min intervals over 30 min, with a final sample collected in the period after rainfall had completed and runoff had ceased.

2.4 Water sample collection and analysis

Runoff samples were collected in 1-L containers (covered to prevent rain water entering the container) at the bottom of the runoff box. Immediately after collection, a sub-sample of the runoff water was passed through a 0.45- μ m filter and analysed colorimetrically for DRP using a nutrient analyser (Konelab 20, Thermo Clinical Labsystems, Finland). A second filtered sub-sample was removed and TDP was measured using potassium persulphate and sulphuric acid digestion (Hach Lange, Germany). An unfiltered sub-sample was removed and analysed for the TP in the same manner as for TDP analysis. The DRP of every sample was measured, while the TDP and TP was measured for the 10, 20 and 30-min interval samples,

as well as for the last sample removed after the rainfall had stopped. The DRP was subtracted from the TDP to give the dissolved unreactive phosphorus (DUP). Particulate phosphorus was calculated by subtracting TDP from TP. In order to determine the SS concentration, a well-mixed, unfiltered sample of runoff water was passed through Whatman GF/C (pore size: 1.2 μ m) filter paper by vacuum filtration. All water samples were tested in accordance with standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater (APHA, 2005). Flow-weighted mean concentrations for nutrients and SS in runoff were determined by dividing the total mass load for the runoff event by the total flow volume for the same period.

Measurements of pH and dissolved oxygen (DO) were also conducted using a pH probe (WTW SenTix 41 probe with a pH 330 meter, WTW, Germany) and a DO probe (WTW Oxi 315i meter with a CelloX 325 oxygen sensor, WTW, Germany), respectively. The time to runoff was also recorded and the runoff ratio for each flume was determined. The runoff ratio is defined as the ratio of the volume of surface runoff to the amount of rainfall applied over the duration of the rainfall simulation.

2.5 Statistical Analysis

The analysis was carried out as a rainfall interval (time 48 h or 216 h after application) by treatment (biosolids or MBM type and rate) factorial experiment with the non-randomised times modelled with a repeated measures structure. As there were only two time intervals, all correlation models gave the same result. The rainfall simulator data was analysed using the GLIMMIX Procedure of the Statistical Analyses System (SAS Institute, 2004) with each flume as the experimental unit. For all analyses, significance was given as $p < 0.05$. Dissolved reactive phosphorus, DUP, PP, TDP, TP, SS, DO, pH and runoff ratio were analysed as repeated measures using the MIXED procedure of SAS with Tukey-Kramer adjustment for

multiple comparisons with a covariance structure to account for correlations between the repeated measures. The dependent variables were: DRP, DUP, PP, TDP, TP, SS, DO, pH and runoff ratio for this experimental analysis. For all the above analyses, the fixed effects were: treatment, time, treatment \times time, and flume. Time and treatment were the repeated measures. Where interactions were significant, the comparisons within the means for the time by treatment combinations were examined. Where interactions were not significant, the main effects were interpreted and comparisons within each main effect were examined.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Soil analysis and rainfall simulator test

The soil used in this study was a non-calcareous soil with a low pH. This could lead to high amounts of available Al and Fe, which can bind with P, rendering it unavailable. However, the soil had high OM levels (18%; Table 1), and given that ~12-14% is the threshold between a mineral and organic soil type, the Al and Fe in biosolids may be complexed in OM and would be unavailable. Therefore, this soil had limited capacity to bind the added P and the high OM may have worked against the amendments by complexing the Al or Fe in them. The OM content of the soil is an important parameter, which determines soil suitability of receiving MBM and biosolids.

Treatment, time and their interactions all had significant effects on DRP, TP and TDP concentrations. Time had the greatest effect for DRP and TP concentrations, while treatment was more significant for TDP. Treatment and a treatment \times time interaction were significant for DUP and PP, but not time on its own. The average FWMCs and load (mass release) of DRP, DUP and PP in the surface runoff for the two rainfall events, at both application rates, are shown in Figures 1 and 2. Anaerobically digested biosolids released the least amount of

DRP into surface runoff for both application rates and both rainfall events. There was no significant difference in DRP losses between the control and all treatments when compared for the maximum legal application rate ($p < 0.05$). All treatments, at both application rates, and the study control, released DRP in excess of the $30 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$, the concentration over which significant deterioration of rivers and other surface water bodies may occur (Clabby et al., 2008). However, owing to the buffering capacity of receiving waters, it is likely that these concentrations would be considerably reduced in receiving watercourses.

Low ash-content MBM, applied at the maximum legal rate, released the most DRP for both rainfall events, and the TD biosolids released the most DRP when applied at double the maximum legal rate ($p < 0.05$). These results followed the same general trend as the desorption study. Of the five materials examined in the desorption test, at the 24-h period, the AD (0.013 g kg^{-1}) and LS (0.015 g kg^{-1}) biosolids released the least amount of DRP (Figure 3); this was followed by MBM (HA) (0.446 g kg^{-1}), TD biosolids (0.569 g kg^{-1}) and MBM (LA) (0.713 g kg^{-1}), the latter of which produced DRP concentrations 70 times larger than the AD and LS biosolids. With the exception of the TD biosolids, all the treatments released 90% of their DRP after 1 h of continuous mixing with water.

Lime-stabilised biosolids released the most TP into the surface runoff at both application rates ($p < 0.05$). The main purpose of the lime addition to biosolids is to remove pathogens (Epstein, 2002). However, liming is sometimes associated with an initial flush of soluble OM and dissolved organic P, which can increase P losses in runoff (Murphy, 2007). With the exception of the LS biosolids, at both application rates, there was no statistical difference between the TP concentrations during both rainfall events. Although there was no significant difference in pH between treatments, at an elevated pH similar to the range measured in the

current study (pH 6 – 8), organic P can be more soluble due to desorption or dispersion of OM (Hannapel et al., 1964). With the exception of three cases (RE 2 of the control and RE 1 of the TD biosolids applied at both rates), the surface runoff comprised mainly PP throughout all of the treatments, with less than 50% present as DRP (Figure 4). The relatively small amount of highly mobile P means that measures such as buffer zones would trap most of the P in surface runoff.

The runoff ratio for each rainfall event is displayed in Figure 5. The addition of biosolids to grass has been found in some cases to affect the volume of surface runoff from soil: Joshua et al. (1998) applied a one-time application of AD biosolids at rates of 0, 30, 60 and 120 t DS ha⁻¹ and, over a 3-y period, found that soil-only control plots produced more runoff than those applied with biosolids, and that increasing biosolids application produced decreasing runoff volumes for the biosolids-treated plots. However, Meyer et al. (2001) found that the application of composted biosolids, at rates of 0, 40 and 80 t ha⁻¹, did not significantly affect mean runoff, even though runoff values were smaller on biosolids-treated plots. In the current study, when applied at the maximum legal application rate, LS biosolids and MBM (HA) increased the volume of surface runoff. When the treatments were applied at double the maximum legal application rate, all treatments increased the volume of surface runoff, but in most cases, these increases were not significant ($p>0.05$). Although the rate of application was low in comparison to other studies that examined surface runoff (Joshua et al., 1998; Meyer et al., 2001), these results would suggest that higher applications of biosolids and MBM could produce larger volumes of surface runoff, which would impede drainage through the soil structure. There was no correlation between runoff ratio and total mass or concentration of P released. The period between the rainfall events allowed both the soil and

biosolids to dry out, therefore when rainfall was applied during RE 2, there was water taken in by both the biosolids and soil.

With the exception of TD biosolids, all treatments, applied at the maximum and twice the maximum legal application rate, released lower concentrations of SS during the second rainfall event than during the first rainfall event (Figure 6). The increase in SS for the TD biosolids from RE 1 to RE 2 could be due to the breakdown of the biosolids over time. Lime-stabilised biosolids exceeded the allowable discharge limit for the release of SS to surface waters (35 mg L⁻¹; S.I. 419 of 1994) at both application rates. Low ash MBM and TD biosolids also exceeded the discharge limits on the legal and double the maximum legal application rates, respectively. The incorporation of biosolids into the top layer of soil, as opposed to a surface application, may assist in the reduction of SS. Meyer et al. (2001) reported reductions in the SS lost to surface runoff compared to control plots (plots receiving no biosolids) when biosolids were incorporated into the top 0.1 – 0.2 m soil layer.

3.2 Time to Runoff

The time to runoff for each amendment and application rate are presented in the on-line supplementary data. For each treatment and application rate, the time to runoff increased from RE 1 to RE2. The period between RE 1 and RE 2 allowed the grassed sods to dry out which, in turn, increased the amount of time required during RE 2 for the sods to saturate and for runoff to commence. With the exception of the AD biosolids applied at the maximum legal rate and TD biosolids applied at both application rates, all other amendments decreased the time to runoff compared to the corresponding control results.

4. Conclusions

This study showed that treatment, time interval and their interactions all had significant effects on DRP, TP and TDP concentrations in surface runoff after application of biosolids (lime-stabilised, thermally dried and anaerobically digested) and MBM (low ash and high ash content) to a grassland soil. Time interval had the greatest effect for DRP and TP concentrations, while treatment was more significant for TDP. All treatments released DRP concentrations in excess of 30 $\mu\text{g DRP L}^{-1}$ and runoff comprised > 50% particulate P for all treatments. The study found that soil type influences the quality of runoff generated. Further research is needed to further investigate this effect.

Acknowledgements

The first author gratefully acknowledges the award of the EMBARK scholarship from the Irish Research Council to support this study. The authors would also like to thank Brian Cloonan, Western Proteins, Ballyhaunis and David Gahan, SEDE Ireland, for their advice and assistance. The authors would also like to thank Cornelius O'Flynn, Liam Gary Henry and Ana João Serrenho.

References

- APHA (1995). *Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater*. Washington: American Public Health Association.
- Brennan, R.B., Fenton, O., Grant, J., & Healy, M.G. (2011). Impact of chemical amendment of dairy cattle slurry on phosphorus, suspended sediment and metal loss to runoff from a grassland soil. *Science of the Total Environment*, 409, 5111–5118
- Brennan, R.B., Healy, M.G., Grant, J., Ibrahim, T.G., & Fenton, O. (2012). Incidental phosphorus and nitrogen loss from grassland plots receiving chemically amended dairy cattle slurry. *Science of the Total Environment*, 441, 132–140
- British Standards Institution (1990a). *Determination of particle size distribution. British standard methods of test for soils for civil engineering purposes. BS 1377: 1990:2*. London: British Standards Institution.
- BSI (1990b). *Determination by mass-loss on ignition. British standard methods of test for soils for civil engineering purposes. Chemical and electro-chemical tests. BS 1377:1990:3*. London: British Standards Institution.
- Clabby, K.J., Bradley, C., Craig, M., Daly, D., Lucey, J., McGarrigle, M., O’Boyle, S., Tierney, D. & Bowman, J. (2008). Water Quality in Ireland 2004-2006. Environmental Protection Agency, County Wexford.

375 Domagalski, J.L., & Johnson, H.M. (2011). Subsurface transport of orthophosphate in five
 376 agricultural watersheds, USA. *Journal of Hydrology*, 409, 157-171.
 377

378 Enterprise Ireland (2011) EnviroCentre.ie. Animal by-products legislation - An explanatory
 379 guide. [http://www.envirocentre.ie/includes/documents/Animal%20By-](http://www.envirocentre.ie/includes/documents/Animal%20By-Products%20March%202011.pdf)
 380 [Products%20March%202011.pdf](http://www.envirocentre.ie/includes/documents/Animal%20By-Products%20March%202011.pdf) Accessed 19 June 2013
 381

382 Environmental Protection Agency. (2012). Monaghan, S., Shannon, D., Wall, B., O'Leary, G.
 383 Focus on Urban Waste Water Discharges in Ireland.
 384 http://www.epa.ie/downloads/pubs/water/wastewater/uww/UWW_Report.pdf
 385

386 Epstein, E (2002) Land application of sewage sludge and biosolids. CRC Press.
 387

388 European Commission (1999) Council Directive 1999/31/EC of 26 April 1999 on the landfill
 389 of waste. Official Journal L 182, 16/07/1999. [http://eur-](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31999L0031:EN:HTML)
 390 [lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31999L0031:EN:HTML](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:31999L0031:EN:HTML) Accessed 7
 391 October 2013
 392

393 European Commission (2000) Council Decision of 4 December 2000 concerning certain
 394 protection measures with regard to transmissible spongiform encephalopathies and the
 395 feeding of animal protein (2000/766/EC). Official Journal of the European Communities
 396 07.12.2000 (L 306/32). http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/tse_bse/docs/d00-766.pdf
 397 Accessed 7 December 2013.
 398

399 European Commission (2009) Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the
400 Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources and
401 amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC
402
403 European Commission (2002) Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 of the European parliament
404 and of the council of 3 October 2002 laying down health rules concerning animal by-products
405 not intended for human consumption, 2002, Available at: [http://eur-](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/consleg/2002/R/02002R1774-20070101-en.pdf)
406 [lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/consleg/2002/R/02002R1774-20070101-en.pdf](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/site/en/consleg/2002/R/02002R1774-20070101-en.pdf). Accessed 7
407 December 2013.
408
409 European Commission (2006) Commission Regulation (EC) No 181/2006 of 1 February
410 2006 implementing Regulation (EC) No 1774/2002 as regards organic fertilisers and soil
411 improvers other than manure and amending that Regulation, 2006, Official Journal of the
412 European Union 02.02.2006 (L 29/31).
413
414 European Economic Community (1986) Council Directive of 12 June 1986 on the protection
415 of the environment, and in particular of the soil, when sewage sludge is used in agriculture
416 (86/278/EEC), 1986. [http://www.efma.org/PRODUCT-STEWARDSHIP-PROGRAM-](http://www.efma.org/PRODUCT-STEWARDSHIP-PROGRAM-10/images/86278EEC.pdf)
417 [10/images/86278EEC.pdf](http://www.efma.org/PRODUCT-STEWARDSHIP-PROGRAM-10/images/86278EEC.pdf) Accessed 7 December 2013.
418
419 Fehily Timoney and Company (1999) Codes of good practice for the use of biosolids in
420 agriculture - guidelines for farmers.
421 <http://www.environ.ie/en/Publications/Environment/Water/FileDownload,17228,en.pdf>
422 Accessed 7 December 2013.
423

424 Fenton, O., Healy, M.G., Rodgers, M., & O'hUallachain, D. (2009). Site-specific P
 425 absorbency of ochre from acid mine-drainage near an abandoned Cu-S mine in the Avoca-
 426 Avonmore catchment, Ireland. *Clay Minerals*, 44, 113-124.

427

428 Fenton, O., Schulte, R.P.O., Jordan, P., Lalor, S.T.J., & Richards, K.G. (2011). Time lag: a
 429 methodology for the estimation of vertical and horizontal travel and flushing timescales to
 430 nitrate threshold concentrations in Irish aquifers. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 14, 419-
 431 431.

432

433 Galbally, P., Ryan, D., Fagan, C.C., Finnan, J., Grant, J., & McDonnell, K. (2013). Biosolid
 434 and distillery effluent amendments to Irish short rotation coppiced willow plantations:
 435 impacts on groundwater quality and soil. *Agriculture Water Management*, 116, 193 – 203.

436

437 Gerba, C.P., & Smith, J.E. (2005). Sources of pathogenic microorganisms and their fate
 438 during land application of wastes. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 34, 42-48.

439

440 Hannapel, R.J., Fuller, W.H., Fox, R.H. (1964). Phosphorus movement in a calcareous soil:
 441 II. Soil microbial activity and organic phosphorus movement. *Soil Science*, 97, 421 – 427.

442

443 Inter Departmental/Agency Committee on Disposal Options for MBM (2003)
 444 [http://www.lagangroup.co.uk/lagan_cement/downloads/report_inter_departmental_committe](http://www.lagangroup.co.uk/lagan_cement/downloads/report_inter_departmental_committee.pdf)
 445 [e.pdf](http://www.lagangroup.co.uk/lagan_cement/downloads/report_inter_departmental_committee.pdf). Accessed 7 December 2013.

446

447 Joshua, W.D., Michalk, D.L., Curtis, I.H., Salt, M., & Osborne, G.J. (1998). The potential for
 448 contamination of soil and surface waters from sewage sludge (biosolids) in a sheep grazing
 449 study, Australia. *Geoderma* 84, 135-156.

450

451 Lucid, J.D., Fenton, O., & Healy, M.G. (2013). Estimation of maximum biosolids and meat
 452 and bone meal application to a low P index soil and a method to test for nutrient and metal
 453 losses. *Water, Air and Soil Pollution*, 224, 1464-1475.

454

455 Meyer, V.F., Redente, E.F., Barbarick, K.A., & Brobst, R. (2001) Biosolids applications
 456 affect runoff water quality following forest fire. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 30, 1528-
 457 1532.

458

459 Mondini, C., Cayuela, M.L., Sinicco, T., Sánchez-Monedero, M.A., Bertolone, E., & Bardi,
 460 L. (2008). Soil application of meat and bone meal. Short-term effects on mineralization
 461 dynamics and soil biochemical and microbiological properties. *Soil Biology and*
 462 *Biochemistry*, 40, 462-474.

463

464 Morgan, M.F. (1941). Chemical soil diagnosis by the universal soil testing system.
 465 Connecticut Agricultural Experimental Station Bulletin 450. Connecticut, New Haven.

466

467 Murphy, P.N.C. (2007). Lime and cow slurry application temporarily increases organic
 468 phosphorus mobility in an acid soil. *European Journal of Soil Science*, 58, 794 – 801.

469

470 O' Flynn, C.J., Fenton, O., & Healy, M.G. (2012a). Evaluation of amendments to control
 471 phosphorus losses in runoff from pig slurry applications to land. *Clean Soil Air Water*,
 472 40,164–170
 473

474 O' Flynn, C.J., Fenton, O., Wilson, P., & Healy, M.G. (2012b). Impact of pig slurry
 475 amendments on phosphorus, suspended sediment and metal losses in laboratory runoff boxes
 476 under simulated rainfall. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 113, 78-84
 477

478 Regan, J.T., Rodgers, M., Healy, M.G., Kirwan, L., & Fenton, O. (2010) Determining
 479 phosphorus and sediment release rates from five Irish tillage soils. *Journal of Environmental*
 480 *Quality*, 39, 1-8
 481

482 SAS Institute (2004) SASV9.1. SAS/STAT® user's guide. Cary, NC. SAS Institute Inc.
 483

484 Sustainable Energy Ireland (2004) Bioenergy in Ireland. Department of Communications,
 485 Marine and Natural Resources. Dublin.
 486

487 Statutory Instrument No. 419 of 1994, Environment Protection Agency Act, 1992 (Urban
 488 waste water treatment regulations, 1994).
 489 <http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/1994/en/si/0419.html> Accessed 7 January 2013
 490

491 Statutory Instrument No. 551 of 2002. Diseases of Animal Act 1966 (Transmissible
 492 spongiform encephalopathies) (meat and bone meal and poultry offal) Order 2002.
 493 <http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2002/en/si/0551.html> Accessed 7 December 2013.
 494

495 Statutory Instrument No. 253 of 2008, Diseases Of Animals Act 1966 (Transmissible
 496 Spongiform Encephalopathies) (fertilisers and soil improvers).
 497 <http://www.attorneygeneral.ie/esi/2008/B26298.pdf> Accessed 7 December 2013.
 498
 499 Statutory Instrument 31. European Union (Good agricultural practice for protection of
 500 waters) Regulations 2014. Statutory Instruments. SI No. 31 of 2014. Department of
 501 Environment, Heritage and Local Government, The Stationary Office, Dublin, 54 p.
 502
 503 U.S. EPA (1993) Standards for the use or disposal of sewage sludge.
 504 <http://water.epa.gov/scitech/wastetech/biosolids/upload/fr2-19-93.pdf> Accessed 7 December
 505 2013.
 506
 507 Wall, D., Jordan, P., Melland, A.R., Mellande, P.-E., Buckley, C., Reaney, S.M., Shortle, G.
 508 (2011) Using the nutrient transfer continuum concept to evaluate the European Union
 509 Nitrates Directive National Action Programme. *Environmental Science Policy*, 14, 664-674
 510
 511 Williams, J.D., Wilkins, D.E., McCool, D.K., Baarstad, L.L., Klepper, B.L., Papendick, R.I.
 512 (1997). A new rainfall simulator for use in low-energy rainfall areas. *Applied Engineering in*
 513 *Agriculture*, 14, 243–247
 514
 515 Ylivainio, K., Uusitalo, R., Turtola, E (2008) Meat bone meal and fox manure as P sources for
 516 ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum*) grown on a limed soil. *Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems*,
 517 81, 267-278.
 518
 519
 520

Captions for Figures

Figure 1 Average flow-weighted dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), dissolved unreactive phosphorus (DUP) and particulate phosphorus (PP), which collectively make-up the total phosphorus (TP), in runoff after each rainfall simulation event for the treatments applied at both the maximum legal (a) and double the maximum legal (b) rate. The concentrations measured for first rainfall event and the second rainfall event are denoted by '1' and '2', respectively. Dashed line represents $30 \mu\text{g P L}^{-1}$ maximum admissible concentration for surface waters (Clabby et al., 2008).

Figure 2 Average flow-weighted dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), dissolved unreactive phosphorus (DUP) and particulate phosphorus (PP), which collectively make-up the total phosphorus (TP), in runoff after each rainfall simulation event for the treatments applied at both the maximum legal (a) and double the maximum legal (b) rate. The concentrations measured for first rainfall event and the second rainfall event are denoted by '1' and '2', respectively.

Figure 3 Phosphorus desorption from the treatments examined.

Figure 4 The average % of dissolved reactive phosphorus (DRP), dissolved unreactive phosphorus (DUP) and particulate phosphorus (PP), which comprise total phosphorus (TP), in runoff for the first ('1') and second ('2') rainfall events.

Figure 5 Runoff ratios from each rainfall simulation event for the treatments applied at both the maximum legal (a) and double the maximum legal (b) rate.

546

547 **Figure 6** Average flow weighted mean concentrations of suspended solids in runoff after
548 each rainfall simulation event for the treatments applied at both the maximum legal (a) and
549 double the maximum legal (b) rate. The concentrations measured for first rainfall event and
550 the second rainfall event are denoted by '1' and '2', respectively. The dashed line represents
551 the 35 mg L⁻¹ standard (S.I. No 419 of 1994).

Table 1. Classification of soil used in this experiment. Standard deviations, where multiple sampling (n=3) was conducted, are in brackets.

Water extractable phosphorus (g kg^{-1})	0.00249 (0.00054)
pH	5.63
Lime requirement pH	5.90
Morgan's P (mg L^{-1})	1.12(0.09) (P Index 1)
K (mg L^{-1})	203.24
Mg (mg L^{-1})	239.5
Organic matter (%)	18.18 (1.19)

Table 2. Application rates of biosolids and meat and bone meal (MBM) to the soil in this study using a P Index 1 soil.

Nutrient Type	Maximum legal		Double the maximum legal	
	application rate ^a		application rate	
	Wet weight	Dry solids	Wet weight	Dry solids
	-----Tonnes ha ⁻¹ -----			
AD biosolids	14.8	3.3	29.6	6.6
TD biosolids	3.3	3.0	6.5	6.0
LS biosolids	18.0	5.2	36.0	10.4
MBM (HA)	0.9	0.8	1.7	1.6
MBM (LA)	0.8	0.7	1.5	1.4

^a Legal limits, estimated after Lucid et al. (2013).

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4




Figure 5




Figure 6

