



C-11653 Work Plan

Land Application of Residuals and Chicken Manure in the Lake Okeechobee Watershed: Phosphorus Considerations

December 11, 2000

J.C. Capece¹, G.A. O'Connor², T.A. Obreza³, and C. Perlongo⁴

¹Agricultural Engineer, Southern DataStream, Inc.
18 Marina Drive, LaBelle Florida.


² Professor, Department of Soil and Water Science
University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Gainesville.

³ Professor, Department of Soil and Water Science
University of Florida Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences, Immokalee.

⁴ Environmental Engineer, Southern DataStream, Inc.
6017 NW 27th Terrace, Gainesville Florida.



UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA



Southern
DataStream

Southern DataStream, Inc. PO Box 1577, Labelle FL 33975
Tel: 863-674-5727 Fax: 863-863-1233, e-mail: mail@SouthernDataStream.com

C-11653 Work Plan

Table of Contents

<i>C-11653 Work Plan</i>	3
<i>Objectives and Scope</i>	3
<i>Background</i>	3
<i>Literature Review</i>	3
Phosphorus and Eutrophication	3
Soil P Testing	4
Land Application of Waste Materials	5
Biosolids	6
Poultry Litter	8
Water Treatment Plant Residuals	9
<i>Demonstration Project Design</i>	11
<i>Site Selection</i>	12
<i>Demonstration Plots Layout</i>	12
<i>Characterization of Wastes and Soil</i>	16
<i>Residuals Selection and Application</i>	16
<i>Flow Measurement and Samplers</i>	18
<i>Ground Water Wells</i>	18
<i>Water Sample Analysis</i>	19
<i>Soils and Vegetation Analysis</i>	20
<i>Public Education and Workshops</i>	20
<i>Management Plan</i>	21
<i>Project Reporting and Task Schedule</i>	22
<i>References</i>	23
<i>Appendix 1: QAPP</i>	27
<i>Appendix 2: CompQAP Example</i>	51
<i>Appendix 3: FDEP Agricultural Use Permit</i>	52

C-11653 Work Plan

Land Application of Residuals and Chicken Manure in the Lake Okeechobee Watershed: Phosphorus Considerations

December 11, 2000

J.C. Capece, G.A. O'Connor, T.A. Obreza, and C. Perlongo

Objectives and Scope

The objective of this project is to evaluate the plant, soil, and water phosphorus (P) implications of applying domestic wastewater residuals (biosolids), animal manure, and water treatment residuals to south-central Florida cattle pastures. This objective will be met by undertaking a three-year field study in which a biosolids and a chicken manure are applied at different treatment levels, with and without water treatment residuals, on half-acre pastureland plots in the Lake Okeechobee Basin. The project includes sampling and measurement of waste products, soils, surface and ground waters, and vegetation for phosphorus accumulation and transport indicators. Results will be assembled and recommendations formulated on appropriate application rates of the tested waste materials. Planning, results and recommendations will be discussed with the public in two educational workshops.

Background

Disposal of both human and animal waste products is an unavoidable byproduct of population and economic growth. Land application of wastewater residuals and domestic animal wastes is a natural way of recycling nutrients and organic matter and achieving increases in soil productivity. However, the beneficial aspects of land application of waste materials must not be exploited at the expense of the potential environmental implications of such disposal/recycling practices.

More than 12 million acres of grassland in Florida require fertilizer to achieve an acceptable forage production level. Of these, 5 million acres are planted with bahiagrass. Pasturelands are some of the most productive plant systems regarding downward movement of nutrients through the soil. Permanent grass pastures are capable of high adsorption of nutrients due to prolific root mass they produce (Muchovej, 1997). Given the particular sensitivity of some Florida soils to significant leaching, studies of the fate of biosolids-bound P are prudent (O'Connor and Sarkar, 1999) if land application of biosolids is to become more widespread in the state.

Literature Review

Phosphorus and Eutrophication

Phosphorus is an essential element for plant growth, and its input has long been recognized as necessary to maintain profitable crop production. Phosphorus inputs can also increase the biological productivity of surface waters. Although N and C are also essential to the growth of aquatic biota, most attention has focused on P inputs, because of the difficulty in controlling the exchange of N and C between the atmosphere and water. Thus, P is often the limiting element, and its control is of prime importance in reducing the accelerated eutrophication of fresh waters. Large inputs of P from urban wastewater systems, surface runoff, or subsurface groundwater flow can remove this limitation and increase the aquatic biomass to ecologically undesirable levels.

The principal impacts of eutrophication relate to four phenomena: increased aquatic plant growth, oxygen depletion, pH variability, and plant species quality and food chain effects. The eutrophication threshold concentration of P for many P-limited aquatic systems is low, i.e., 0.03 mg/L (Pierzynski, Sims, and Vance, 1994). Daniel et al., (1998) reports that surface water concentrations of inorganic P and total P between 0.01 and 0.02 mg/L are considered critical values above which eutrophication is accelerated. Water bodies with naturally low P concentration (like several important water bodies in Florida) are highly sensitive to external inputs of P associated with fertilizer, manure, and residuals land application. Management of P to avoid eutrophication frequently focuses on reducing P loading to water bodies by reducing P inputs to agricultural settings and/or controlling the movement of P. Once a water body has been identified as being sensitive to P inputs, source fields and soils vulnerable to P loss in runoff must be carefully managed. For soils with a high or very high soil test P (STP) level, options may involve applying no more P than removed annually by the crop. Clearly, unlimited P inputs and numbers of animals within an agricultural system will lead to impaired water resources (Sharpley et al., 1994).

The loss of P from agricultural land is dependent on several factors, including the relative importance of surface and subsurface runoff in a watershed area, land management, and the amount, form, and availability of P in soil. The export of P in runoff occurs in particulate and dissolved forms. Particulate P includes P associated with soil particles and organic matter eroded during flow events and constitutes the major proportion of P transported from most cultivated land. Runoff from grass or forestland or non-erosive soils carries little sediment and is, therefore, generally dominated by the dissolved form. While dissolved P is, for the most part, immediately available for biological uptake, sediment P can be a long-term source of P for aquatic biota (Daniel et al., 1998). Generally the P concentration in water percolating through the soil profile is small due to sorption of P by P-deficient subsoil. Exceptions occur in acid organic or peaty soils where the adsorption affinity and capacity for P are low due to the predominantly negatively charged surfaces and the complexing of Al and Fe by organic matter. Similarly, P is more susceptible to movement through sandy soils with low P sorption capacities (Daniel et al., 1998).

Many Florida (and other US sandy coastal) soils present unique challenges for P management. On the positive side, such soils usually have low surface slopes and high water infiltration rates that promote water entry into the soil profile rather than runoff (and soil erosion). Extremely sandy Florida soils, however, often have poor P retention characteristics and allow P leaching; P behavior that is unique to most areas of the US. Leached (soluble, not particulate) P can contaminate shallow groundwater and, eventually, surface waters. This occurs via lateral (subsurface) flow of perched water tables to intercepting drains that then connect to surface water bodies. Harris et al. (1995) developed an indexing procedure that identifies Florida soils particularly susceptible to P leaching. Their scheme identifies many Spodosols (a dominant soil order in Florida), with their seasonally high water tables and poor P-retention capacities, as highly problematic.

Soil P Testing

A simple system is needed to assess the effect of agricultural management on the vulnerability for P movement from landscapes. The P indexing system (Lemunyon and Gilbert, 1993) has been developed as a field tool to fill this need. In developing the P indexing system, the transport (erosion and runoff) and source factors (STP and P applications), have been incorporated as they relate to P movement. The P indexing system effectively identifies sources of P movement within a watershed or basin area (Sharpley et al., 1993).

Rodriguez et al. (1995) tested two new methods to predict crop response to soil phosphorus. They found that the precision, range, and detection limit values from their new methods were similar to those from the original Mehlich P1 soil test. The Mehlich P1 test is used to estimate available soil P in sandy acid soils low in organic matter. In the new methods, an H₂SO₄ extracting solution of either the same ionic strength (Method A) or same acidity (Method B) as the original Mehlich P1 extractant, extracted similar amounts of soil P.

Anion Exchange Membrane (AEM) values are a good tool for predicting potential P movement by soil erosion or runoff. Gale et al. (2000) found that membrane bound P was strongly correlated with manure application rate and available P (NaHCO₃). Best management practices for manure disposal need to consider the potential for P movement and the AEM technique provides a means for evaluating potential movement from the soil surface.

Accumulation of P in soil can be estimated by soil testing and the P sorption capacity of soils can be determined from sorption isotherms. However, sorption isotherms are time-consuming (Sample et al., 1980). Bache and Williams (1971) proposed the use of a P sorption index, obtained from equilibration of a soil for 17 h with a single P solution at a ratio of 1.5 g P/kg soil, as a fast and simple means to estimate P sorption maxima for soils. This was confirmed by Mozaffari and Sims (1994) for surface and subsurface horizons of soils from a watershed dominated by animal-based agriculture.

Efficient management of P amendments on soils susceptible to P loss often involves the subsurface placement of fertilizer and manure and the periodic inversion of P stratified soils to redistribute surface P accumulations throughout the root zone. Both practices may indirectly reduce the loss of P by decreasing its exposure to surface runoff and by increasing crop uptake of P and yield. A linear relationship exists between P levels in surface soil (0 – 2 cm deep) and Dissolved Reactive P (DRP) concentrations in runoff from the soil surface. Pote et al. (1999) showed that several STP extractants might be useful for predicting DRP concentrations in runoff. Increased concentrations of dissolved reactive P (DRP) in surface runoff are highly correlated to increased STP levels. Also, soil that contains high levels of P from excessive fertilization can become the primary source of DRP in runoff. Effects of STP levels on DRP concentrations in runoff are not always consistent across soil series, and much of the difference can be attributed to soil hydrology. This implies that knowledge of site hydrology can improve the usefulness of STP data for predicting DRP concentration in runoff. Besides, Pote et al. (1999) showed that some of these relationships can change with seasonal changes in field conditions, especially as warm, wet conditions prevalent in the early part of the growing season change to hot, dry conditions in late growing season in most parts of the US.

Land Application of Waste Materials

Long-term sustainability of an ecosystem in part depends on the ability of soils in the ecosystem landscape to recycle nutrients and reduce potential off-site water quality problems. The P sorption capacity of a soil plays a pivotal role in nutrient recycling in agro-ecosystems and in reducing the potential for transport of P to surface waters. This is reflected in increases in soil test P and total P in the surface and subsurface horizons of soils receiving animal manure or municipal biosolids.

From an environmental standpoint, continuous addition of P from animal manure at excessive rates particularly in soils low in Fe, Al and clay may lead to the saturation of a soil's P sorption capacity. Once this occurs, any additional input of P may result in its loss into shallow water tables or drainage water. In the Netherlands, long-term application of P in manures and fertilizers in quantities exceeding crop removal during the past two decades has resulted in saturation of more than 42% of the soils in grasslands with respect to P. As a result, soluble P concentrations as high as 1 mg/L, relative to a critical level of 0.1 mg/L for eutrophication of P limiting surface waters, have been reported in these areas (Breeuwsma and Silva, 1994). Sims (1991) pointed out that excess P accumulated in soils treated with organic waste (such as animal manure) has the potential to leach into the soil and enter the surface water through lateral transport.

Vivenkandan and Fixen (1990) measured soil test P in an Egan silt loam (Udic Haplostolls) 8 years after one single application of beef cattle manure. Despite P removal by eight crops of corn, available P in the surface horizon as estimated by Bray P1 (0.03M NH₄F + 0.025M HCl) was 169 and 320 mg/kg in plots that received 90 and 280 Mg/ha of manure relative to 45 mg/kg P in the check plot. Application of beef feedlot manure for 8 years at the rate of 67 Mg/ha/yr to a Pullman clay loam (Torretic Paleustolls) used for continuous grain sorghum production increased total P in the surface horizon (0 to 30 cm) from 353 mg/kg in an untreated check plot to 996 mg/kg in manured plots. Available P, as measured by Bray P1 (0.03M NH₄F + 0.025M HCl), increased from 15 to 230 mg/kg (Sharpley et al., 1984).

In addition to increasing soil test P and total P, addition of animal manure has been shown by some researchers to reduce the capacity of soil to sorb additional P. Application of beef cattle manure to an Egan silty clay loam (Udic Haplustoll) in southeast South Dakota increased soil soluble P to 27.5, 50, and 71.6 mg/L for treatments that received manure at the rates of 90, 199 and 280 Mg/ha (dry weight basis) respectively, relative to 3.2 mg/L in the check plot (Vivenkandan and Fixen, 1990). However, addition of animal manure has not decreased P sorption capacity in all soils (Field et al., 1985). The reduction in P sorption capacity of some manure amended soils has been

attributed to the complexation of organic acids and anions (produced as manure decomposition end products) with Fe and Al and subsequent blocking of P retention sites by these complexes (Reddy et al., 1980; Sharpley and Halverson, 1993; Sims and Wolf, 1994; Singh and Jones, 1976).

Reddy et al. (2000) investigated the combined use of manure and fertilizer P, finding applying both the manure and fertilizer forms resulted in a greater crop yield and P uptake than applying the same total P rate using only one of these two P forms. When fertilizer P was supplied together with manure, the accretion of organic P was promoted. Generally the increases in organic P fractions due to manure additions are strongly associated with a concomitant increase in the soil organic carbon. Cropping without manure and fertilizer P depletes soil organic P, while regular additions of manure and fertilizer P favors its accumulation. The magnitude of depletion/build-up is strikingly larger for moderately-labile organic P (MLOP) and moderately-resistant organic P (MROP) fractions compared to others, indicating that these two fractions are major sources and sinks for plant-available P in soil.

These findings have significant implications for soils under cattle production in Florida. Much of Florida's cattle industry is located in south and central Florida. Soils in this area are primarily Spodosols, Entisols and Histosols (Flaig and Reddy, 1995). Surface horizons have low P sorption capacity due to low clay, iron, and aluminum. Additionally, many of these soils are artificially drained. These conditions may enhance the lateral movement of water and nutrients toward the drainage ditch and ultimately into the nearby streams and lakes (Campbell et al., 1995; Graetz and Nair, 1995).

Biosolids

One of the primary concerns associated with the land application of biosolids (sewage sludge) to pastures and rangelands is its effects on the quality of runoff water. The greatest challenge in land application of biosolids for beneficial use is predicting P bioavailability and N mineralization rates so that managers can amend the soil with the proper agronomic rate and avoid soil nutrient losses to ground and surface waters. Application rates of biosolids (and other non-hazardous wastes) are customarily based on the N needs of the crop being grown. This practice results in P inputs (~200 kg P/Ha) that usually exceed the amounts of P removed in normal crop production (~20-40 kg P/Ha), and promotes P accumulation in soils. In many states, such over-application of waste-borne P (and fertilizer-P) has led to 30% or more of soils being rated as high or excessively high in soil test P (Gartley and Sims, 1994). If a mechanism exists to transport particulate or soluble P to nearby surface waters, such P-rich soils may promote eutrophication.

Unfortunately, biosolids-bound P reactions have not received nearly the study that biosolids-bound N has. Evaluation of P availability in land-applied biosolids should consider the chemical nature and amount of P in the residuals and the physicochemical properties of the soil being amended. The forms and solubilities of P in residuals vary greatly with waste treatment processes, the composition of the wastewater, and the mode of digester operation (Sommers and Sutton, 1980). It follows that different types of residuals added to the same soil might exhibit varying degrees of P bioavailability.

O'Connor and Sarkar (1999) experimented laboratory, greenhouse and field data to determine the fate of residuals-borne P in Florida soils and to develop environmentally sound residuals application guidelines for P. Objectives include determining the bioavailability of residuals-P, the forms of P in residuals and how the forms change in residuals-amended soils, and the extent to which residuals-P leaches. Laboratory studies focused on P forms; greenhouse studies addressed bioavailability and leaching objective.

Bioavailability of residuals-P was evaluated by plant uptake of P relative to fertilizer-P applied at equivalent total P rates. As expected, bioavailability depended on both the residuals and amended soil properties. Residuals with abundant KCl-extractable P (readily available) had P bioavailabilities nearly as great as fertilizer-P, whereas residuals with low KCl-P values had much lower P bioavailabilities. Differences in P bioavailabilities were masked in high soil test-P soils that adsorbed abundant P, but were obvious in poorly P-sorbing soils in both greenhouse and field studies. They recommend characterization of both residuals (KCl-extractable P) and soils (oxalate-extractable Fe and Al, soil test-P) to estimate effective residuals-P bioavailability. Using total residuals-P, or some fixed percentage of total P does not accurately assess residuals-P availability.

Residuals-P is dominantly inorganic and, for the residuals studied by O'Connor and Sarkar (1999), primarily in Fe and Al forms. In soils, or residuals, with abundant oxalate-extractable Fe and Al, P solubility, bioavailability, and leachability are limited. Residuals with abundant Fe and Al can increase P retention temporarily (2-3 years in the field) in poorly P-sorbing soils, making P less subject to leaching. Results suggest that adding Fe and Al to a waste treatment stream, or mixing domestic residuals with water treatment residuals, can significantly reduce residuals-P solubility and P leaching in poorly P-sorbing soils (O'Connor and Sarkar, 1999).

Mehlich-I and Fe-strip soil tests were equally effective in predicting plant uptake of P. Mehlich-I is routinely run by soil testing labs and, thus, likely preferable. Preliminary data suggest that measuring Fe and Al in the Mehlich-I extract may also successfully characterize a soil's P-sorbing tendency. The soil test may, thus, serve both agronomic and environmental testing purposes.

Based on data collected from laboratory, greenhouse and field studies, O'Connor and Sarkar (1999) developed a qualitative scheme useful for guiding residuals applications. The scheme identifies poorly P-sorbing soils amended with high KCl-P class AA residuals as being undesirable (extensive leaching of P expected). Strongly P-sorbing soils (with or without abundant native soil test-P) may be safely amended with class AA residuals. Soils with intermediate oxalate-extractable Fe and Al contents can be problematic, depending upon residuals-P characteristics. Residuals application rates may have to be reduced to supply P equivalent to plant P needs to protect against P leaching when residuals are high in KCl-P.

Pierce et al. (1998) found that surface application of biosolids did not significantly change total or plant species-level aboveground biomass. Surface application of treated municipal sewage sludge was actually observed to reduce runoff in semiarid grasslands. The mechanism for this reduction in runoff yield is increased ground surface roughness. Increased P and NH₄-N concentrations in runoff from sludge-amended plots are simply due to the higher P and NH₄-N loading to the soil. Because contact between the sludge and soil is minimal, the primary mechanism for P transport into runoff is from the soluble and suspended organic fraction. In a study conducted by Harris et al. (1995), all measured N and metals concentrations in runoff from biosolids-amended lands, were less than current water quality standards for agricultural use.

In Florida, required setback distances from surface waters for residuals applications promote soil and residuals retention. This minimizes the threat of surface water contamination with eroded soil-associated (particulate) P. Environmentally sound guidelines for residuals application to such soils can be especially complex. Guidelines should consider the crop needs for nutrients (N, P), initial P status of the soils, P-retention capabilities of the soils, and P characteristics of the residuals. Given the particular sensitivity of some Florida soils to significant leaching, studies of the fate of biosolids-bound P are prudent. Such studies should seek to characterize both the nature of P in biosolids (e.g., forms, extractability or "availability", etc.) and the nature of P reactions in various soils (e.g., reaction products, extractability, retention/release tendencies, etc.). It is possible that environmentally sound residuals application guidelines for P would be biosolids/soil-specific.

Sludge is a valuable source of plant macro and micro nutrients (N, P, Cu, Fe, Mn, Zn) and organic matter, but it also contains heavy metals (Cd, Cr, Ni, Pb) that are potentially hazardous. Leaching of heavy metals is a concern because some metals accumulate in the soil, thus becoming toxic to plants and humans. Land application of biosolids (sewage sludge) can significantly increase heavy metal concentrations in agricultural soils (Sloan et al., 1998). For soil management and water quality purposes, it is important to determine the long-term fate of biosolid-applied heavy metals. Most metals in water treatment sludges occur predominantly in weakly mobile, non-bioavailable forms (Elliott et al., 1990). With increased soil acidification, mobility and bioavailability of metals increases. The initial leaching of heavy metals is attributed to their soluble or exchangeable forms and to the subsequent slow leaching to the solid compounds.

Poultry Litter

Land application of poultry wastes serves a dual role: first, it alleviates the practical problems associated with build-up of litter and manure; second, it fertilizes receiving crops. The application rate depends on whether the primary objective is to maximize the fertility related aspects of the waste or to simply dispose of the waste (Edwards and Daniels, 1992). The excellent fertilizer value has been reported by a number of investigators. Jacobs et al. (1996) list three benefits of using poultry manure and litter as a fertilizer in Florida. The primary benefits are that poultry wastes provide the essential nutrients N/P/K; the secondary plant nutrients calcium, sulfur and magnesium; and the minor nutrients zinc, copper, boron and manganese. A second benefit of poultry manure is that it provides Florida acid soils a source of lime by virtue of the calcium carbonate content of the poultry wastes. A third benefit is the organic matter poultry manure adds to the soil. This enhances the soil moisture holding characteristics of sandy soils thus improving soil retention and uptake of plant nutrients.

Sloan et al. (1996) identifies poultry manure as perhaps the most desirable of the natural fertilizers by virtue of its high nitrogen content delivered in combination with other nutrients and organic matter. Poultry manure is often produced in areas where it is needed for crop, hay, and pasture fertilization. The increased size and frequent clean out of many poultry operations make this material available in sufficient quantities and on a timely basis to supply significant fertilizer needs. Land application of litter has been shown to increase yields of pasture grasses such as tall fescue, orchardgrass, bermudagrass, and tall fescue-clover (Adams et al., 1994). Broiler litter slowly releases nutrients, particularly N, so growth rates of grasses following litter applications are not as pronounced as observed with commercial fertilizers (Honeycutt et al., 1988).

Application of animal manures in excessive amounts can result in increased surface runoff of nutrients and degradation of ground water. In general, plots receiving poultry litter have significantly greater losses of most nutrient parameters (Sauer et al. 1999). However, the potential for nutrient losses can be reduced by using soil amendments such as by-products of the drinking water pretreatment process, commonly referred to as Water Treatment Residuals (Al-WTR), alum sludge, or alum hydrosolids. This material contains aluminum oxides capable of adsorbing soluble P (Peters and Basta, 1996). WTR aluminum exists as an insoluble form of aluminum oxide and does not dissolve in soil environments of pH greater than 5. Gallimore et al. (1999) documented that reductions in P runoff were attributed to amorphous Al while reductions in $\text{NH}_4\text{-N}$ were related to the cation-exchange capacity of the Al-WTR.

Shreve et al. (1995) conducted a study to determine the effect of chemical amendment (Alum) on P concentrations and load in runoff and to evaluate the effects of amended litter on forage production. Litter was broadcast applied to fescue plots at 11.2 Mg/ha (dry weight basis) alone and in combination with alum sulfate at a 1:5 amendment/litter ratio. Rainfall simulators were used to produce 3 runoff events at 2, 9, and 16 days after litter application. The addition of alum reduced P concentrations in runoff by 87 and 63% of that from litter alone for the first and second runoff events, respectively. The application rate of poultry litter has been observed to also affect $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ concentration in vadose water under fescue plots, such that fertilizing pastures with poultry litter may enhance $\text{NO}_3\text{-N}$ movement to groundwater (Adams et al., 1994). The risk of increased sediment runoff into nearby water bodies is a concern often raised regarding Al-WTR application to pasture lands. However, Gallimore et al. (1999) has shown that Al-WTRs can be applied without a resulting increase in sediments or Al concentrations in runoff.

Addition of poultry litter to soil greatly increases soluble reactive P concentrations but additions of chemically-amended litters, especially with high rates of alum and ferrous sulfate, significantly decreases these concentrations compared to additions of unamended litter. The addition of Al and Fe amendments to litter results in low P solubility in soils over a wide pH range for long time periods. Shreve et al. (1996) found that with addition of litter containing 200 mg alum/kg litter, soil SRP decreased from initial concentrations of 4.5 to 11.5 mg P/kg down to approximately 1 mg P/kg after 294 days. Direct application of aluminum sulfate [$\text{Al}_2(\text{SO}_4)_3 \cdot 14\text{H}_2\text{O}$] to poultry litter greatly reduces P concentrations in runoff and decreases NH_3 volatilization. Shreve et al., (1996) cites precipitation and/or adsorption reactions as the probable mechanism for this observed decrease in P solubility in the litter. The mechanism for inhibition of NH_3 volatilization is aluminum sulfate lowering the litter pH, which controls the $\text{NH}_3\text{:NH}_4$ ratio.

Soluble P can also be reduced by mixing poultry litter with direct chemical amendments such as CaO, CaCO₃, AlSO₄ or FeSO₄. Calcium reacts with soluble P to form insoluble Ca phosphates in soils at moderate to high pH (pH>6). Gallimore et al. (1999) showed that Ca(OH)₂ (slaked lime) decreased P solubility in poultry litter in the same manner as CaO (quick lime). Reagent-grade CaO and Ca(OH)₂ were found to be the best amendments in reducing soluble P in chicken litter. Since slaked lime is less caustic, this treatment would be preferable to quick lime, which can cause severe burns upon skin contact (Moore et al., 1994).

Liming of poultry litter can increase its pH but this change dissipates with time, due to equilibration with atmospheric CO₂. This gradual reduction in pH after liming may result in increased P solubility, since calcium phosphates solubility is extremely pH dependent (Moore et al., 1994). The mechanism by which alum removes phosphate from solution is pH-dependent. Under acidic conditions (pH<6) AlPO₄ forms, whereas at pH 6 to 8, an Al(OH)₃ floc forms, which removes P from solution by sorption of inorganic phosphate and entrapment of organic particles containing P. The optimum pH range for P removal by Al is 5.5 to 8.0 (Moore et al., 1994).

Removal of P using iron, (Fe₂(SO₄)₃• 2H₂O or FeCl₃) is enhanced by maintaining the litter pH at a higher level. An adjustment of pH is also necessary for ferric iron systems that contain SO₄, such as the Fe₂(SO₄)₃• 2H₂O treatment, because when extremely acid conditions occur, water soluble P levels increase dramatically. Ferrous sulfate (FeSO₄• 7H₂O) additions greatly decrease the solubility of P in poultry litter. Water soluble P concentrations were not significantly different in FeSO₄ treatments amended with CaCO₃, indicating that P removal with this compound is less pH dependent than for some of the other Fe compounds (Robinson et al., 1995).

Robinson and Sharpley (1996) found that the reaction of P added as poultry litter leachate was different from that added as KH₂PO₄ to six soils. In leachate-treated soils, the short-term bioavailability of P (strip P) was consistently lower than in KH₂PO₄-treated soils. From an agronomic standpoint, the data indicate that poultry litter has a higher residual P fertilizer value than the KH₂PO₄ source. They concluded that manure application rates for agronomically and environmentally sound P management guidelines should not be based solely on data from mineral fertilizer trials.

The influence of drying temperature on the release of N and P should be considered when determining the optimum timing of poultry litter application. It is suggested that the timing of poultry litter application coincide with active periods of crop growth to combine maximum agronomic productivity with minimum edge-of-field losses of N and P to surface and groundwater (Robinson et al., 1995).

Water Treatment Plant Residuals

Alum [Al₂(SO₄)₃• 14H₂O] is used in the drinking water treatment process to destabilize colloids for subsequent flocculation and water clarification. Alum sludge is the water treatment residual (Al-WTR) from this process and is considered to be a waste material. Biosolids (sewage sludge) are a by-product of the wastewater treatment process. The disposal of Al-WTR alone would be beneficial to soils high in P, since the Al-WTR can adsorb soluble P. Likewise, the co-application of Al-WTR and biosolids may be advantageous to municipalities as a means of disposing of high P bearing biosolids in an environmentally sound manner. Because of Al-WTR's ability to adsorb P, Al-WTR could play a role in the removal of P in sewage treatment plant effluent (Ippolito et al., 1999). It is possible that too much Al-WTR applied to a soil, in conjunction with biosolids, can induce natural P deficiencies. If co-applying Al-WTR and biosolids to soil at ratios greater than 8:1, all biosolids available P, as well as some plant-available soil P, could be adsorbed by the Al-WTR. The P adsorptive capacity of Al-WTR is a function of Al-WTR age, pH, particle-size fraction and surface area, and the availability of P. Increasing the ratio of Al-WTR to biosolids in a mixed material will decrease shoot P concentration in some type of grass such as in blue grama. Increased Al-WTR rates increases dry matter yields, decreases P and Al shoot concentrations. This increase in dry matter combined with the decrease in concentrations results in no net effect on total mass of P and Al uptake into grass shoots (Ippolito et al., 1999).

Alum amendments reduce trace metals in runoff. This reduction appeared to be related to the concentration of soluble organic C (SOC). Metals concentrations were higher using untreated litter compared to alum-treated litter (Moore et al., 1998). Alum-treated litter or alum hydrosolids have neutral or alkaline pH and Al exists as insoluble Al oxides, which should not release toxic Al or produce acidity in soil or aqueous systems (Peters and Basta, 1996). Copper concentrations are significantly lower when alum-treated litter is used rather than normal litter.

Soil pH is an indicator of the relative availability of nutrients. Low soil pH stress is a major growth limitation to crop production in many regions. At low pH, it is not often the H^+ ion activity that limits growth, but the toxicity and/or deficiency of other elements. On the basis of existing literature, Al toxicity is one of the yield-limiting factors that have been identified in acid soils. It is very difficult to determine the direct effects of H^+ ion toxicity on plant growth in acid soils because of the changing interrelationships that occur between pH and Al concentrations in the soil solution, and the changing availability of essential nutrients (Fageria et al., 1990).

Aluminum concentration can be sufficiently high in acid soils with pH values of 5.5 or below to be toxic to plants. The aluminum species which are responsible for the phytotoxic effect appear to be a small fraction of the total aluminum in the soil solution. It is not possible at present to run routine chemical tests to accurately determine the level of toxic aluminum species in individual soils. The bioassay for identifying Al-toxic soils can be simplified based on the observation that aluminum toxicity first affects the roots. It is possible to use root length to quantify aluminum toxicity in soil. At this early growth stage, in many species the root system is limited to one primary root, which simplifies the measurement. Many soil horizons with pH values of 5 or below are not toxic to plant roots. The poor relationship between pH and root length indicates that we cannot assume that poor plant growth on an acid soil is the result of aluminum toxicity. Even soils with high levels of soil solution aluminum may not produce toxic effects in plants. Much of the solution aluminum in non-toxic, acid soils must be in complexes or other forms which keep the activity of toxic forms very low. The consistency of results when test parameters are varied indicate that a two-day petri dish technique should be a useful routine test or diagnostic tool for work with acid soils (Sawhney et al., 1996).

Demonstration Project Design

The demonstration project design of the study (Tables 1 and 2) will consist of 51 plots, 3 plots evaluating a traditional commercial fertilizer product plus a 48-plot randomized block study consisting of three blocks with each block evaluating two phosphorus sources (one biosolids and one chicken manure) applied at 4 treatment levels, with and without an alum-base water treatment plant residual. The anticipated treatments for the biosolids are 0, 0.5, 1, and 5 tons per acre dry weight basis. These treatments were formulated using IFAS recommendations for both N and P nutrient requirements of south Florida pasturelands. In addition, a supplemental commercial fertilizer treatment (#17) is included in each block. This commercial fertilizer treatment will be applied at the P agronomic rate. The treatments may vary in number of P sources or rates being investigated within contractual constraints if new information becomes available to the TRT that deems design change beneficial to the objectives of the study.

Table 1. Description of treatments, 2x4x2 factorial.

Treatment No.	P Source	P Rate, kg/ha	Alum Rate, kg/ha
1	Residual	P1 (Control)	0
2	Residual	P1	X
3	Residual	P2	0
4	Residual	P2	X
5	Residual	P3	0
6	Residual	P3	X
7	Residual	P4	0
8	Residual	P4	X
9	Manure	P1 (Control)	0
10	Manure	P1	X
11	Manure	P2	0
12	Manure	P2	X
13	Manure	P3	0
14	Manure	P3	X
15	Manure	P4	0
16	Manure	P4	X
17*	Commercial Fertilizer	P3	0

* Represents a supplemental treatment in addition to the balanced randomized block design

Table 2. Sample layout, with treatments randomized within each block.

Block 1

9	8	13	3	10	7	1	14	11	2	15	12	5	6	16	4	17
---	---	----	---	----	---	---	----	----	---	----	----	---	---	----	---	----

Block 2

17	3	14	8	12	1	6	2	16	7	13	4	9	5	10	15	11
----	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	----	----	----

Block 3

6	1	9	2	5	10	7	13	4	11	14	8	15	12	16	3	17
---	---	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	----	----	---	----	----	----	---	----

Site Selection

Site selection is a critical step in the project development process. Considerations in the selection of a host site for the experiment include:

1. Cooperation of land owner
2. Availability of waste materials for land application
3. DEP permit for land application of biosolids
4. Suitability and uniformity of soil type
5. Reasonable background levels of phosphorus in soils
6. Uniform topography and drainage characteristics over 20 acres
7. Proximity to research support infrastructure
8. Accessibility by residuals application and hay harvesting equipment
9. Suitable grass type (stargrass or bahiagrass)

Officials of the SFWMD have selected a pasture on Kirton Ranch as the project site. The project will be located at this site if the background soil P levels are deemed acceptable. Kirton Ranch is located approximately six miles northeast of Okeechobee. If the Kirton Ranch site is determined to be unsuitable for the project then the project will be conducted at MacArthur Agro-ecology Research Center (MAERC) at Buck Island Ranch. Buck Island Ranch is within the Lake Okeechobee Basin. This site is 10,000 acres and is a ranch typical of the Lake Okeechobee region. The MAERC ranch manager and research director have expressed a willingness to host the project, thus satisfying condition 1.

Condition 2 (availability of waste materials) is an unanswered question requiring further investigation.

Condition 3 (DEP permit), if needed, will be pursued with DEP officials at the South District office in Ft. Myers. They have expressed willingness to facilitate the permitting process for this project. Requirements include: completion of the permit application (AUP.pdf) and producing a copy of the SFWMD Staff Report for the Surface Water Management Permit issued for the ranch. A representative from the DEP Ft. Myers office has offered to conduct a site inspection and expedite the permit.

Meeting conditions 4, 5, 6, and 8 are dependent on finding a suitable 33-acre site.

If the Kirton Ranch site assessment proves unsatisfactory then steps to finalize the Buck Island Ranch site selection will include:

- A. Confirming the willingness of MAERC to host the project.
- B. Inspecting the NRCS detailed soil survey conducted on the ranch in 1998.
- C. Selecting a specific site with minimal ditch, fence, and access problems.
- D. Testing the soil to confirm suitable background P concentrations.
- E. Securing the DEP permit for residuals application (Appendix 3).

Demonstration Plots Layout

The layout of the demonstration project plots will be selected based on a combination of site constraints and project needs. Site constraints may include available land, ditching patterns, soil variability, roadways, residuals permit conditions, etc. The dimensions selected for the plots will affect several project factors including ditch construction and maintenance costs, fencing costs, runoff variability as dictated by rainfall patterns, runoff magnitude as affected by ditching density, harvesting patterns and costs, and residuals application patterns and costs.

Table 4 summarizes the plot dimension options and their implications for ditch and fencing construction/maintenance. If a geometric configuration for all 51 plots in 3 blocks is selected as shown in Figures 1 and 2 then overall site dimensions can be determined from the plot dimensions. Assuming three separate blocks of 17 plots each then the most viable options for plot sizes appear to be those in the 70' to 100' width range. Plots narrower than 70 feet become highly inefficient relative to ditch & berm requirements, while widths greater than 100 feet represent site selection and rainfall variability problems.

Table 4. Plot dimension options and implications for ditch and fencing costs.

Plot Width	Plot Length	Plot Perimeter	Ditch Inefficiency	Site Width	Site Length	Site Perimeter	Fence Inefficiency
40	545	1169	98%	780	1784	5127	9%
50	436	971	65%	950	1457	4814	2%
60	363	846	43%	1120	1239	4718	0%
70	311	762	29%	1290	1083	4747	1%
80	272	705	19%	1460	967	4854	3%
90	242	664	12%	1630	876	5012	6%
100	218	636	8%	1800	803	5207	10%
110	198	616	4%	1970	744	5428	15%
120	182	603	2%	2140	695	5669	20%
130	168	595	1%	2310	653	5925	26%
140	156	591	0%	2480	617	6193	31%
148	148	590	Square	2608	593	6401	36%

The entire project site (approximately 32 acres) will be surrounded by a fence of sufficient integrity to exclude cattle and also prevent invasion by wild hogs. Hogs have the potential to seriously disrupt the field experiment through their rooting activity, which can leave the plots in a condition similar in appearance to a freshly plowed field.

The earthworks, which define each plot, will be constructed by a subcontractor using methods appropriate to delivering berms and ditches of the desired dimensions of the earthworks. Interior plot ditches and border berms will be initially established at an approximate depth and height of 12 inches relative to the local land surface datum.

The linear feet required for ditches and berms are minimized when the individual plots are square in shape (148 feet by 148 feet). Any deviation from this shape results in an increase in the linear feet of ditches and berms. This is quantified in Table 4 as “ditch inefficiency” calculated as the ratio between the increased ditch length and the minimum possible ditch length (square scenario). Similarly, the linear feet of fencing required for the project is based on the individual plot dimensions combined with the block configuration, as shown in Figure 1. Assuming 3 blocks of 17 plots each, a relationship can be drawn between the individual plot dimensions and the required fencing perimeter. The fencing is minimized when the 32 acre project site is square in shape (1181 feet by 1181 feet). The increase in the perimeter is quantified in Table 4 as the “fence inefficiency” calculated as the ratio between the increase in fence length and the minimum possible perimeter.

Runoff water from the demonstration plots will be carried away from the immediate area by a ditch that will continue downslope for a distance that achieves the required drainage but does not infringe upon any nearby streams or isolated wetlands. The Kirton Ranch topography has sufficient slope to allow the runoff water to be removed, thus avoiding any potentially problematic backwater effects at the individual demonstration plot flumes.

Figure 1. Potential arrangement of plots.





Figure 2. Detailed plan of plots, berms and ditches.



Characterization of Wastes and Soil

Laboratory analyses will be conducted on at least 5 Class B residuals, 1 chicken manure sample, 1 Al-WTR, and 15 representative soil samples. The soil samples will be collected from multiple depths (3) at multiple locations (5) to ensure accurate assessment of the experimental study site. These samples will be analyzed for total solids, pH, conductivity, organic carbon, total and extractable Fe, Al, Ca, Mg, and P. A chemical fractionation procedure will be used to determine the forms and distribution of P in the waste materials and soil. Phosphorus will be fractionated into organic and inorganic forms. The inorganic P will be separated further into labile P, Fe/Al-P and Ca-P by extractions with 1M KCl (O'Connor and Sarkar, 2000), 0.1M NaOH, and 0.5 M HCl., respectively (Hieltjes and Lijklema, 1980). The labile or available P pool in the materials will be evaluated further using iron-oxide strip as performed by Sharpley (1996) and established by Sharpley (1993) and using Mehlich 1 reagent (Sparks, 1996). Phosphorus sorption and desorption properties of the soil and Al-WTR will be determined using batch incubation (Reddy, et al, 1980).

Collection of these samples will be performed by Southern DataStream technical staff operating under SOPs approved by the cooperating UF-IFAS faculty (Dr. George O'Connor and Dr. Tom Obreza) with supplemental input from other cooperating faculty (Dr. Don Graetz and Dr. Rosa Muchovej). The Southern DataStream technical staff will be required to demonstrate competency in the sampling methods to the participating faculty prior to commencement of sampling tasks. Laboratory analyses will be performed by the UF-IFAS Soil Chemistry Laboratory (CompQAP 970022).

Residuals Selection and Application


The residuals selected for this project will be based on local practices and product availability. This decision may remain open until completion of the site construction. Three materials will need to be selected: the waste water plant residual (biosolids), the water treatment plant residual (Al-WTR), and the chicken manure.

There will be four application rates of the biosolids and chicken manure. The first is the zero control and the second is the agronomic P rate. The other two are the "below-P" rate and the "above-P" rate. Determination of the specific agronomic P rate is dependent on the actual hay crop grown at the selected site and the availability of phosphorus in the residuals and soils. The below-P rate will probably be half to a third of the agronomic P rate. Assuming a P requirement for a bahiagrass hay crop of about 20 lbs/acre and a biosolids P content of ~2%, yields a biosolids application rate (based on P) of 0.5 tons/acre. EPA currently allows an assumption of 50% availability of biosolids-P, so the intermediate rate could be 1 ton/acre. The biosolids rate based on N would be approximately 5 tons/acre. This would represent a reasonable above-P application rate. The resulting biosolids treatment levels would be 0, 0.5, 1, and 5 tons/acre. A similar analysis will be performed on the chicken manure product selected for use on the project.

The selection of the single application rate for the water treatment residual will have to be based on analysis of the specific material selected for use in the project. The P sorptive capacity of Al-WTR is a function of material age, pH, particle-size fraction and surface area, and the availability of P. Ippolito et al. (1999) found that co-applying the City of Fort Collins (CO), Al-WTR and biosolids at ratios of 8:1, will adsorb all soluble biosolids P in the blue grama and western wheatgrass study. Beyond this ratio Al-WTR could adsorb all biosolids available P as well as some plant-available P.

Application of the residuals to the hay field plots will represent a significant challenge for a commercial hauler given: (1) the relatively small dimensions of the individual plots, (2) the relatively low application rates of the residuals, and (3) the random nature of the treatment assignments to plots within a block. Ensuring that the hauler applies the proper amount for each plot and does so with good rate precision will require close supervision and a cooperative hauler. Funds have been allocated in the project budget to allow use of special precision application equipment for this task. A buffer zone of at least 5 feet will be established between the application zone and the edge of plot shallow runoff collection ditches. Figure 3 provides an example application pattern for the demonstration project plots.

Figure 3. Residuals application pattern.



Flow Measurement and Samplers

Each demonstration plot will be equipped with a flow-integrating sampler. One of two designs will be used for these samplers. The first design option is a paddlewheel system originally developed by Bottcher and Miller (1991) and recently modified by Dr. Del Bottcher of Soil and Water Engineering Technology, Inc. The second sampler design option is a concept developed by Southern DataStream. It is composed of a Parshall flume combined with a passive head-driven sampler. Both the paddlewheel sampler and the DataStream sampler are specifically designed and adapted to meet the surface water sampling requirements of Florida pasturelands. The paddlewheel samplers have been employed by other SFWMD studies in the Okeechobee region. The primary advantages of the paddlewheel systems are (1) their lack of dependency on external power and control systems, (2) their ability to take and store a flow-integrated sample, (3) flow capacity appropriate for very small research plots, and (4) flow estimates of 20% accuracy based on a simple linear relationship between sample volume and total flow. The paddlewheel responds to flow passing through its rectangular flume by rotating and, with each rotation, picking up a small volume of water and delivering this aliquot to a composite sample collection container.

Observed disadvantages and limitations associated with the paddlewheel samplers include: (1) a nonlinear relationship between flow rate and sampling rate, (2) a tendency of the system to clog and/or jam as the result of vegetative debris in the runoff water, and (3) difficult access for cleaning the internal flume throat section, (4) tight internal clearances required to induce sampling at low runoff rates resulting in the potential for paddle contact with the walls and subsequent sampler malfunction, and (5) inadequate sample container isolation resulting in external contamination from dust, debris and insects. Efforts are being made to introduce design modifications that will reduce these sampler operational limitations.

The samplers will be augmented by secondary flume measurement systems on three of the plots. These data will also be transmitted to an Internet web site through the telemetry system. These data will provide a basis for evaluating the performance of the samplers in acquiring proper flow-weighted water samples. The real time nature of the data delivery system will provide immediate notice of flow events at the project site, thus enabling the field sampling team to collect grab samples during select runoff events. The flow samplers will be placed in small ditches connecting the internal plot perimeter ditch to the external collection/removal ditch. These units will need to be stabilized to avoid damage during wind storms. Another threat to flume/sampler systems is backwater. The current monitoring project at MAERC (Buck Island Ranch) has been plagued with severe backwater from Harney Pond Canal. Efforts will be made to prevent similar problems in the new project.

A weather station and flowmeter counter will be established at one of the flow-integrating sampler sites. The weather station will consist of a tipping bucket raingage and datalogger. Rainfall is an extremely variable parameter for the region and a useful parameter in evaluating runoff and nutrient loading data. All flume samplers proposed for use in the project will be equipped with sensors to monitor sample acquisition rate. All sensors will be connected to a central data-logger and telemetry system that will transmit the resulting data in real time from the flume/sampler sensors and weather station.

Ground Water Wells

Two shallow ground water wells will be installed on each plot. The screens of these two wells will be placed at different depths, separated by the first aquiclude (i.e. spodic horizon). Depth to the spodic horizon in typical Okeechobee soils is approximately 3 feet. A soil of this type would be therefore best monitored using wells placed at depths of 3 and 10 feet with the screen lengths being 1.5 and 5 feet, respectively. Installation of the 2-inch diameter PVC wells will be accomplished using auger methods best suited to the depth of the wells. Appropriate sands backfill will be used over the screen lengths to minimize introduction of sediments into the wells and water samples.

Water Sample Analysis

As outlined in the RFP, water sampling will consist of both composite samples collected bi-weekly during flow periods, surface grab samples collected at the time of composite sample retrieval, and ground water samples collected monthly and after at least 4 rainfall events. During the rainy season, the occurrence of flow events may require sample retrieval from the field more frequently than bi-weekly. Ground water samples will be analyzed for TDPO4, OPO4 and Total Al. Surface runoff grab samples will be analyzed for TDPO4, TPO4, OPO4 and Total Al. Surface water composite samples will be analyzed for TPO4 only. Ground water and surface grab samples will be tested in the field for pH, specific conductance, and dissolved oxygen with an additional temperature recording made on the surface grab samples. It is expected that a total of 2720 samples of each of the three types will be required to meet the sample collection guidelines of the project. These sample sets will include all QA/QC required equipment blanks, field duplicates and split samples. The technical staff will also invite the SFWMD Water Quality Monitoring staff to subject Southern DataStream to one of their standard water quality field audits.

Water quality sampling and analysis will be conducted in the context of approved laboratory CompQAPs, an approved QAPP, and effective SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures). The water analysis contract lab used in this project will possess a FDEP CompQAP as will the Southern DataStream field sampling team. Southern DataStream is producing and will soon file its Comprehensive Quality Assurance Plan with FDEP outlining its methods for sample collection, processing, field equipment and measurements, field filtration, storage, and shipping. Each of these component tasks will be governed by effective SOPs as distributed by FDEP or as developed by Southern DataStream for tasks not addressed by existing SOPs.

Water quality analysis will be conducted by Dr. Donald Graetz utilizing the UF-IFAS Analytical Research Laboratory (ARL). Dr. Graetz and UF-ARL were selected based on their current involvement in similar projects. The Southern DataStream technical staff is very familiar with procedural preferences of Dr. Graetz (chain of custody, shipping requirements, etc.). Maintaining Dr. Graetz as the contract lab liaison will eliminate start-up errors often associated with new lab-client relationships.

GROUNDWATER		
FREQUENCY	SOURCE	ANALYTE
Monthly and Event-basis	Well	TDPO4
	Well	OPO4
	Well	Total Al

SURFACE WATER		
FREQUENCY	SOURCE	ANALYTE
Event-basis Composite (bi-weekly min.)	Flow-integrating Sampler	TPO4
Event-basis (bi-weekly min.)	Grab	TDPO4
	Grab	TPO4
	Grab	OPO4
	Grab	Total Al

Soils and Vegetation Analysis

Soil samples will be taken at incremental depths to represent A (0-5 cm), E, and Bh horizons twice a year and analyzed for pH, total P, extractable Al and Fe and for available P using various tests, as Mehlich-I and Fe-oxide strip paper, for correlation with plant P uptake. It is estimated that a total of 680 samples will be collected and analyzed during a two-year period.

The bahiagrass crop will be cut and baled five times per year, approximately once every 45 days during the growing season. Up to 570 plant samples will be collected to determine dry matter yield, total P and Al content over a period of two years. These analyses will be conducted by the UF-IFAS Soil Chemistry Laboratory.

SOILS		
FREQUENCY	SOURCE	ANALYSES
Semi-annually	Soil Sample	pH
		Total P
		Available P
		Extractable Al
		Extractable Fe

VEGETATION		
FREQUENCY	SOURCE	ANALYSES
5 harvests per growing season	Pasture grass	Dry matter yield
		Total P
		Total Al

Public Education and Workshops

Two public workshops will be held in conjunction with this project. The first will be held in October, 2000 to introduce the public to the demonstration project and solicit input and cooperation in its conduct. The second public workshop will serve to disseminate project results and seek feedback from stakeholders.

Hosting the first workshop will be the four primary agency cooperators in this project (SFWMD, FDEP, FDACS, and UF-IFAS) and the project contractor, Southern DataStream. The workshop will be held in Okeechobee at either the SFWMD auditorium or at the local agricultural education facilities. Targeted for attendance at this workshop will be the regional agricultural producers, environmental interest, residuals generators, and waste haulers. Notices will be distributed to these groups through appropriate means.

The Okeechobee workshops will be conducted by Southern DataStream and the participating UF-IFAS faculty. Southern DataStream will assume final responsibility for the execution of the workshops. However, the public education workshops will be available to IFAS for incorporation into faculty extension programs in other parts of the state.

Management Plan

Southern DataStream project supervision will be performed by Dr. John Capece under the direction of the SFWMD project manager. Providing day-to-day field and data support under the direction of Dr. Capece will be senior technician, Mr. Ed Rawlinson. Mr. Rawlinson will be assisted by a series of short-term (6-12 month) student interns provided by another project subcontractor, Intelligentsia Intellitemps, Inc. During the first year of the project, an environmental engineer, Dr. Claudia Perlongo, will provide technical and academic support for the project. Dr. Capece and one or more UF representatives will participate in the preliminary orientation and site selection meetings. Mr. Rawlinson and the student intern will conduct the sampling and service visits to the project site. Dr. Capece will substitute upon any absence of Mr. Rawlinson and will participate in any special repair visits requiring additional technical expertise.

Supervising the activities of the primary subcontractor (University of Florida IFAS) will be two faculty members of the Soil and Water Science Department, Dr. George A. O'Connor (Principal Investigator) and Dr. Thomas A. Obreza (Co-principal Investigator). The UF faculty (or their technicians and student assistants) will train and/or provide on-site direct supervision of soil, waste, and vegetation sampling.

Project Reporting and Tasks Schedule

Southern DataStream shall be responsible for producing and delivering all reports associated with this project to the SFWMD (Table 5).

Table 5. List of tasks, deliverable, and due dates.

Task	Deliverable	Weeks	Date
	Project Execution Date	0	13-Jul-00
1	PROJECT WORK PLAN		
1.1	Draft Work Plan	9	20-Sep-00
1.2	Final Work Plan	12	5-Oct-00
2	FATE & TRANSPORT OF P IN SOILS		
2.1	Initiate lab characterization	12	5-Oct-00
2.2	Begin construction	16	2-Nov-00
2.3	Complete lab characterization	24	28-Dec-00
2.4	Complete construction	28	25-Jan-01
3	EDUCATION OF LANDOWNERS		
3.1	Initial Workshop	12	Oct-00
3.2	Final Workshop	154	Jul-03
4	REPORTING ACTIVITIES		
4.1.1	Quarterly Report	36	22-Mar-01
4.1.2	Quarterly Report	49	21-Jun-01
4.1.3	Quarterly Report	62	20-Sep-01
4.1.4	Quarterly Report	88	21-Mar-02
4.1.5	Quarterly Report	101	20-Jun-02
4.1.6	Quarterly Report	114	19-Sep-02
4.2	Year 1 Annual Report	75	20-Dec-01
4.3	Year 2 Annual Report	127	19-Dec-02
4.4	Draft manuscript	150	29-May-03
4.5	Draft final report	150	29-May-03
4.6	All data, spreadsheets and programs	156	10-Jul-03
4.7	Final report	156	10-Jul-03
4.8	Final manuscript	156	10-Jul-03

References

- Adams, P.L., T.C. Daniel, D.R. Edwards, D.J. Nichols, D.H. Pote, and H.D. Scott. 1994. Poultry litter and manure contributions to nitrate leaching through the vadose zone. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 58 (4): 1206-1211.
- Bache, B.W. and E.G. Williams. 1971. A phosphate Sorption Index for Soils. *Journal of Soil Science*. 22: 289-301.
- Bottcher, A.B. and L. Miller. 1991. Flow Integrating Water Sampler for Remote Conditions. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*. Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 400-403.
- Breeuwsma, A., and S. Silva. 1994. Phosphorus fertilization and environmental effects in The Netherlands and the Po region (Italy). Rep. 57. Wageningen, The Netherlands: Agric. Res. Dep., The Winand Staring Centre for Integrated Land, Soil and Water Research.
- Campbell, K. L., J. C. Capece and T. K. Tremwel. 1995. Surface/subsurface hydrology and phosphorus transport in the Kissimmee River Basin, Florida. *Ecological Engineering* 5:301-330.
- Daniel, T.C., A.N. Sharpley, and J.L. Lemunyon. 1998. Agricultural phosphorus and eutrophication (November 1996) A symposium overview. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 27 (2): 251-257.
- Edwards, D.R. and T.C. Daniels. 1992. Environmental impacts of on-farm poultry wastes disposal – a review. *Bioresource Technology* 41:9-33.
- Elliott, H.A., B.A. Dempsey, and P.J. Maille. 1990. Content and fractionation of heavy metals in water treatment sludges. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 19(2): 330-334.
- Fageria, N.K., V.C. Baligar, D.G. Edwards. 1990. Soil-plant nutrient relationships at low pH stress. BK: Baligar, V. C. and R. R. Duncan (Ed.). *Crops as enhancers of nutrient use*. xiv+574p. 475-508.
- Flaig, E.G. and K.R. Reddy. 1995. Fate of phosphorus in the Lake Okeechobee watershed, Florida: Overview and recommendations. *Ecol. Eng.* 5:127-143.
- Gale, P.M., M.D. Mullen, C. Cieslik, D.D. Tyler, B.N. Duck, M. Kirchner, and J. McCure. 2000. Phosphorus distribution and availability in response to dairy manure applications. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*. 31 (5&6): 553-565.
- Gallimore, L.E., N.T. Basta, D.E. Storm, M.E. Payton, R.H. Huhnke, and M.D. Smolen. 1999. Water treatment residual to reduce nutrients in surface runoff from agricultural land. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 28 (5): 1474-1478.
- Gartley, K.L. and J.T. Sims. 1994. Phosphorus Soil Testing: Environmental Uses and Implications. *Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* 25: 1565-1582.
- Graetz, D.A.; Nair, V.D. 1995: Fate of phosphorus in Florida spodosols contaminated with cattle manure. – *Ecological Engineering*. 5 (2-3): 163-181.
- Harris Pierce, R.L., E.F. Redente, and K.A. Barbarick. 1995. Sewage sludge application effects on runoff water quality in a semiarid grassland. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 24 (1): 112-115.
- Hieltjes, A.H.M., and L. Lijklema. 1980. Fractionation of inorganic phosphates in calcareous sediments. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 9:405-407.
- Honeycutt, H.J., C.P. West, and J.M. Phillips. 1988. Response of bermudagrass, tall fescue, and tall-fescueclover to broiler litter and commercial fertilizer. *Arkansas Agric. Exp. Stat. Bull.* 913.

- Ippolito, J.A., K.A. Barbarick, and E.F. Redente. 1999. Co-application effects of water treatment residuals and biosolids on two range grasses. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 28 (5): 1644-1650.
- Jacobs, R.D., D. Sloan, and J. Jacob. 1996. Cage layer manure: An important resource for land use. Fact Sheet PS-9. Cooperative Extension Service, University of Florida, Gainesville. 2 p.
- Lemunyon, J.L., and R.G. Gilbert. 1993. The concept and need for a phosphorus assessment tool. *J. Prod. Agric.* 6:483-486.
- Moore, P.A. Jr., T.C. Daniel, J.T. Gilmour, B.R. Shreve, D.R. Edwards, and B.H. Wood. 1998. Decreasing metal runoff from poultry litter with aluminum sulfate. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 27 (1): 92-99.
- Moore, P.A. Jr., D.M. Miller, T.C. Daniel, B.R. Shreve, and D.R. Edwards. 1994. Decreasing phosphorus solubility and inhibiting ammonia volatilization in poultry litter with alum. *Poultry-Science*. 73 (SUPPL. 1): 151.
- Mozaffari, P.M., and J.T. Sims. 1994. Phosphorus availability and sorption in an Atlantic Coastal Plain watershed dominated by animal-based agriculture. *Soil Science* 157:97-107.
- Muchovej, R.M. 1997. Beneficial use of residuals on pasturelands. pp. 29-34. in *Biosolids management in Florida*. Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee. 58 p.
- O'Connor G.A. and D. Sarkar. 1999. Fate of land applied residuals-bound phosphorus, contract No. WM 661, Amendment No. 2, March 1997 – November 1999. Final report. Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Tallahassee.
- Peters, J.M. and N.T. Basta. 1996. Reduction of excessive bioavailable phosphorus in soils by using municipal and industrial wastes. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 25 (6): 1236-1241.
- Pierce, B.L., E.F. Redente, K.A. Barbarick, R.B. Brobst, and P. Hegeman. 1998. Plant biomass and elemental changes in shrubland forages following biosolids application. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 27 (4): 789-794.
- Pierzynski, G.M., J.T. Sims, and G. Vance. 1994. *Soil and Environmental Quality*. Lewis Publishers, Chelsea, MI. 313 p.
- Pote, D.H., T.C. Daniel, D.J. Nichols, P.A. Jr Moore, D.M. Miller and D.R. Edwards. 1999. Seasonal and soil-drying effects on runoff phosphorus relationships to soil phosphorus. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 63 (4): 1006-1012.
- Reddy, D.D., A.S. Rao, and T.R. Rupa. 2000. Effects of continuous use of cattle manure and fertilizer phosphorus on crop yields and soil organic phosphorus in a Vertisol. *Bioresource Technology*. 75: 113-118.
- Reddy, K.R., G.A. O'Connor, and P.M. Gale. 1998. Phosphorus sorption capacities of wetland soils and stream sediments impacted by dairy effluent. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 27:438-447.
- Reddy, K. R., M. R. Overcash, R. Khaleel, and P. W. Westerman. 1980. Phosphorus adsorption-desorption characteristics of two soils utilized for disposal of animal wastes. *J. Environ. Qual.* 9:86-92.
- Robinson, J.S. and A.N. Sharpley. 1996. Reaction in soil of phosphorus released from poultry litter. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 60: 1583-1588.
- Robinson, J.S., Sharpley, A.N. and Smith, S.J. 1995. The effect of animal manure applications on the forms of soil phosphorus. p. 43-48. In K. Steele (Ed.), *Impact of animal waste on the land-water interface*. Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Rodriguez, J.B., J.R. Self, G.A. Peterson, D.G. Westfall, and S.M. Workman. 1995. Comparison of extractable phosphorus from two sulfuric acid methods with the Mehlich phosphorus test number one. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*. 26 (19-20): 3165-3173.

- Sample, E. C., R. J. Soper, and G. J. Racz. 1980. Reactions of phosphorus fertilizers in soils. p. 263-310. In F. E. Khasawneh, E. C. Sample, and E. J. Kamprath (ed) *The Role of Phosphorus in Agriculture*, American Society of Agronomy, Madison, WI.
- Sauer, T.J., T.C. Daniel, P.A.Jr Moore, K.P. Coffey, D.J. Nichols, and C.P. West. 1999. Poultry litter and grazing animal waste effects on runoff water quality. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 28 (3): 860-865.
- Sawhney, B.L., G.J. Bugbee, and D.E. Stilwell. 1996. Leachability of arsenic from field containers filled with plant growth medium amended with biosolids compost. *Compost Science and Utilization*. 4 (4): 35-39.
- Sharpley, A.N. 1996. Availability of residual phosphorus in manured soils. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.* 60:1459-1466.
- Sharpley, A.N. 1993. An innovative approach to estimate bioavailable phosphorus in agricultural runoff using iron oxide-impregnated paper. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 22:597-601.
- Sharpley, A.N., S.C. Chapra, R. Wedepohl, J.T. Sims, T.C. Daniel, and K.R. Reddy. 1994. Managing agricultural phosphorus for protection of surface waters: Issues and options. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 23 (3): 437-451.
- Sharpley, A.N., T.C. Daniel, and D.R. Edwards. 1993. Phosphorus movement in the landscape. *Journal of Production Agriculture*. 6 (4): 492-500.
- Sharpley, A.N., T.C. Daniel, J.T. Sims and D.H. Pote. 1996. Determining environmentally sound soil phosphorus levels. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation* 51: 160-166.
- Sharpley, A. and A. Halverson. 1993. The management of soil phosphorus availability and its effect on surface water quality. *Advances in Soil Science*.
- Sharpley, A. N., S. J. Smith, B. A. Stewart, and A. C. Mathers. 1984. Forms of phosphorus in soil receiving cattle feedlot waste. *Journal of Environmental Quality* 13: 211-215.
- Shreve, B.R., P.A.Jr Moore, T.C. Daniel, D.R. Edwards, and D.M. Miller. 1995. Reduction of phosphorus in runoff from field-applied poultry litter using chemical amendments. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 24 (1): 106-111.
- Shreve, B.R., P.A.Jr Moore, D.M. Miller, T.C. Daniel, and D.R. Edwards. 1996. Long-term phosphorus solubility in soils receiving poultry litter treated with aluminum, calcium, and iron amendments. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*. 27 (11-12): 2493-2510.
- Sims, J.T. 1991. Environmental management of phosphorus in agricultural and municipal wastes. pp. 16-29 *In* F.J. Sikora (ed.). *Future Directions for Agricultural Phosphorus Research*. Nat. Fert. Environ. Res. Cent., TVA Muscle Shoals, AL.
- Sims, J.T. and D.C. Wolf. 1994. Poultry waste management: Agricultural and environmental issues. *Adv. in Agron.* 52: 1-83.
- Singh, B.B., and J.P. Jones. 1976. Phosphorus sorption and desorption characteristics of soil as affected by organic residues. *Soil Science Society of American Journal*. 40:389-39.
- Sloan, J.J., R.H. Dowdy, and M.S. Dolan. 1998. Recovery of biosolids-applied heavy metals sixteen years after application. *Journal of Environmental Quality*. 27: 1312-1317.
- Sloan, D.R., G. Kidder, and R.D. Jacobs. 1996. Poultry manure as a fertilizer. Fact Sheet PS-1. Cooperative Extension Service, University of Florida, Gainesville. 2 p.
- Sparks, D.L. (ed.) 1996. *Methods of Soil Analysis Part 3. Chemical Methods*. Soil Science Society of America. Madison, WI.
- Sommers, L. E., and A. L. Sutton. 1980. Use of waste materials as sources of phosphorus. p. 515-544. In: F. E. Khasawneh et al. (ed.) *The role of phosphorus in agriculture*. ASA, CSSA, and SSSA, Madison, WI.

Vivenkandan, M. and P.E. Fixen. 1990. Effect of large manure application on soil P intensity. *Commun. in Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* 21:287-290.

Appendix 1: QAPP

Section 1.0
Date: 11/15/00
Page 1 of 1

Land Application of Residuals and Chicken Manure in the Lake Okeechobee Watershed: Phosphorus Considerations SFWMD Contract No. C-11653

Prepared by: Dr. J.C. Capece,
Southern DataStream, Inc.
PO Box 1577 LaBelle FL 33975
Tel: (863) 674-5727, Fax: (863) 675-1233

Dr. John Capece, Project Director

Date

Dr. Claudia Perlongo, Project QA Officer

Date

Dr. Tom Obreza, UF-IFAS SWFRL Project Officer

Date

Mr. Benno Eidus, UF-IFAS SWFRL QA Officer

Date

Dr. George O'Connor, UF-IFAS SCL Project Officer

Date

Ms. Angela Choate, UF-IFAS SCL QA Officer

Date

Dr. Donald Graetz, WBL-UF Project Officer

Date

Ms. Dawn Lucas, WBL-UF QA Officer

Date

Dr. Rao Mylavarapu, ARL-UF Project Officer

Date

Mr. Jim Bartos, ARL-UF QA Officer

Date

Mr. Jim Laing, SFWMD Project Manager

Date

Mr. Maurice Barker, FDEP Project Manager

Date

Mr. Andrew Tintle, FDEP Technical/QA Officer

Date

Section 2.0 TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUALITY ASSURANCE ELEMENTS

Section	Title	No.of Pages	Rev. Date
1.0	Title Page	1	
2.0	Table of Contents	2	
3.0	Project Description	9	
3.1	Site Identification and History		
3.1.1	Site History		
3.1.2	Summary of the Historical Data		
3.2	Project Scope and Purpose		
3.2.1	Purpose of the Project		
3.2.2	Intended end use of the data		
3.2.3	Projected Schedule and Scope of Work		
3.3	Project Organization		
3.3.1	Project Organization		
3.3.2	Personnel Modifications or Additions		
3.4	Project Objectives		
3.4.1	Data Quality Objectives		
3.4.2	Proposed samples for project		
3.4.3	Summary of Matrix Types, Analytical Methods and QA Targets		
4.0	Field Procedures and Quality Control	3	
4.1	Sampling Equipment		
4.2	Field Activities		
4.2.1	Sampling Protocols		
4.2.2	Disposal Protocols		
4.3	Field Measurements		
5.0	Laboratory Procedures and Quality Control	4	
5.1	Laboratory QC Checks		
6.0	Quality Assurance Management	1	
6.1	Corrective Action		
6.2	Performance and Systems Audits		
6.2.1	Field Activities		
6.2.2	Laboratory Activities		
6.3	Quality Assurance Reports		

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure Number and Name</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Rev.</u> <u>Date</u>
3.1 Kirton Ranch Water Quality Data	3-3	
3.2 Project Organization	3-4	
3.3 Site Map – State of Florida	3-5	
3.4 Site Map – Site Location	3-5	
3.5 Site Map – Plot Orientation	3-6	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table Number and Name</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Rev.</u> <u>Date</u>
3.1 Summary of Data	3-3	
3.2 Proposed Samples, Matrices and Analytical Methods for the Project	3-8 to 3-10	
4.1 Proposed Sampling Equipment	4-2	
4.2 Field Activities	4-3	

LIST OF APPENDICES

<u>Appendix Name</u>	<u>No. of</u> <u>Pages</u>	<u>Rev.</u> <u>Date</u>
Field Sampling and Preparation Protocols not in CompQAPs	1	

Section 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

3.1 Site Identification and History

Site Name: Kirton Ranch

Site Address: NE 80th Ave, Okeechobee, FL 34972

3.1.1 Site history:

The project site is Kirton Ranch, located on the eastern boarder of Okeechobee County, Florida, (Sections 29, Township 36S, Range 36E). The ranch is situated 7 miles northeast of Okeechobee, and accessible from SR 70 on NE 80th Ave. The Ranch is located north of the Lake Okeechobee. Elevations range from 17 to 21 feet. The ranch is dominated by improved pastures. The properties is owned and managed by Dudley Kirton.

3.1.2 Summary of the historical data:

The South Florida Water Management District has collected nutrient concentration and loading data at Kirton Ranch during the past years. Representative data are presented in Table 3.1. The table also includes citations to source documents.

3.2 Project Scope and Purpose

3.2.1 Purpose of this project:

This plan is submitted as a requirement of Contract No. C-11653. The objective of the proposed project is to assess the water quality (phosphorus) implications of land application of three waste materials: waste water treatment plant residuals, potable water treatment plant residuals, and chicken manure.

3.2.2 Intended end use of the data:

- Permit Compliance
- Feasibility Study
- Consent Order Compliance
- Remedial Action
- Contamination Assessment
- Water Quality Data Base (specify database)
- Facility Operating Report
- Other: water quality monitoring to assess residuals management practice effectiveness

3.2.3 Projected schedule and scope of work:

Projected Beginning Date: July 13, 2000

Projected Ending Date: July 13, 2003

Major Project Tasks

Task	Deliverable	Weeks	Date
	Project Execution Date	0	13-Jul-00
1	PROJECT WORK PLAN		
1.1	Draft Work Plan	6	24-Aug-00
1.2	Final Work Plan	12	5-Oct-00
2	FATE & TRANSPORT OF P IN SOILS		
2.1	Initiate lab characterization	12	5-Oct-00
2.2	Begin construction	16	2-Nov-00
2.3	Complete lab characterization	24	28-Dec-00
2.4	Complete construction	28	25-Jan-01
3	EDUCATION OF LANDOWNERS		
3.1	Initial Workshop		Oct-00
3.2	Final Workshop		Jul-03
4	REPORTING ACTIVITIES		
4.1.1	Quarterly Report	36	22-Mar-01
4.1.2	Quarterly Report	49	21-Jun-01
4.1.3	Quarterly Report	62	20-Sep-01
4.1.4	Quarterly Report	88	21-Mar-02
4.1.5	Quarterly Report	101	20-Jun-02
4.1.6	Quarterly Report	114	19-Sep-02
4.2	Year 1 Annual Report	75	20-Dec-01
4.3	Year 2 Annual Report	127	19-Dec-02
4.4	Draft manuscript	150	29-May-03
4.5	Draft final report	150	29-May-03
4.6	All data, spreadsheets and programs	156	10-Jul-03
4.7	Final report	156	10-Jul-03
4.8	Final manuscript	156	10-Jul-03

Table 3.1


Summary of Historical Data.

Previous research conducted at Kirton Ranch shows mean total phosphorus concentration ranging from 0.03 mg/L to 3.48 mg/L.

Site	Average P Concentration [mg/L]	Standard Deviation [mg/L]	Maximum P Concentration [mg/L]	Minimum P Concentration [mg/L]
1	0.12	0.04	0.18	0.08
2	0.64	0.50	3.48	0.03
3	0.37	0.41	1.81	0.06

Figure 3.1

Kirton Ranch Water Quality Data. (SFWMMD Monitoring Site 2)



3.3 Project Organization

3.3.1 Project organization:

Sample collection activities will be conducted by personnel under the supervision of the Project Director and the Project QA Officer. The laboratory analytical work will be performed by the Analytical Research Lab (UF-ARL), Soil Chemistry Laboratory (UF-SCL) Southwest Florida Research Laboratory (UF-SWFRL) and Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (UF-WBL). Refer to Figure 3.1. for the specific organization of this project.

3.3.2 Personnel modifications or additions:

All project personnel are included in the CompQAPs of the referenced organizations.

3.4 Project Objectives

3.4.1. Data quality objectives:

- The data quality objectives for this project are the routine QA targets listed in the laboratory CompQAP.
- The minimum detection limits to be achieved for this study differ from the routine detection limits specified in the laboratory CompQAP and are included as a part of Table 3.2.
- The precision and accuracy requirements differ from the routine targets specified in the laboratory CompQAP and are included as a part of Table 3.2

3.4.2. Proposed samples for project:

- a. See Figure 3.2 for a map of the project site.
- b. See Table 3.2 of this Section for a summary the sampling and analysis activities.

3.4.3. Summary of matrix types, analytical methods and QA targets:

Field and laboratory analytical measurements are presented in Table 3.2.

Figure 3.1

Project Organization




Figure 3.3
Site Map – State of Florida



Figure 3.4
Site Map – Site Location



Figure 3.5

Site Map – Plot Orientation

Samples will be taken at each plot flume location and at shallow wells on each plot.




TABLE 3.2

PROPOSED SAMPLES, MATRICES AND ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR THE PROJECT

The standards criteria outlined in DEP Rule 62-550 are the detection limit criteria for this project. **The detection limits reported for this project shall at least meet, or be lower than the stated standards.**

FIELD MEASUREMENTS WILL BE PERFORMED BY: Southern Data Stream Laboratory (SDSL), whose CompQAP # is _____ dated _____.

PARAMETER
pH
Oxygen Dissolved
Temperature
Specific Conductance

***METHOD #**
AOAC 973.41
EPA 360.1
SM 2550B
AOAC 973.40

*see web page for links to these methods (<http://www.SouthernDataStream.com/SDSL>)

FIELD SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES WILL BE PERFORMED BY THE ABOVE NAMED ORGANIZATION.

LABORATORY WATER ANALYSES WILL BE PERFORMED BY: Analytical Research Laboratory (UF-ARL), whose CompQAP # is 900007G/5 with annual amendments approved on 06/01/00.

FREQUENCY	SAMPLE MATRIX	SAMPLE SOURCE	# SAMPLES	QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY				ANALYTICAL METHOD #	COMPONENT	QA TARGETS*		
				TB	EB	FD	P			A	MDL	
Event-basis composite samples	Water	Ditch	2720	0	136	272		EPA 200.7	TPO4			
Bi-weekly and event-based grab samples	Water	Ditch	2720	0	136	272		EPA 365.1	TPO4			
	Water	Ditch	2720	0	136	272		EPA 365.1	TDPO4			
	Water	Ditch	2720	0	136	272		EPA 200.7	OPO4			
	Water	Ditch	2720	0	136	272		EPA 200.7	Total Al			
Monthly and event-based grab samples	Water	Wells	2720	0	136	272		EPA 365.1	TDPO4			
	Water	Wells	2720	0	136	272		EPA 365.1	OPO4			
	Water	Wells	2720	0	136	272		EPA 200.7	Total Al			

TB - Trip Blank EB - Equipment Blank FD - Field duplicate P - Precision A - Accuracy MDL - Method Detection Limit
*These values need to be completed if the Data Quality Objectives stated in the project description are different from the routine QA objectives cited in the CompQAP(s) or are not included in the CompQAP(s).

TABLE 3.2a

PROPOSED SAMPLES, MATRICES AND ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR THE PROJECT

FIELD SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES WILL BE PERFORMED BY THE ABOVE NAMED ORGANIZATION.

LABORATORY SOIL ANALYSES WILL BE PERFORMED BY: Soil Chemistry Laboratory (UF-SCL), whose CompQAP # is 970022 with annual amendments approved on 04/07/2000.

FREQUENCY	SAMPLE MATRIX	SAMPLE SOURCE	# SAMPLES	QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY				ANALYTICAL METHOD #	COMPONENT	QA TARGETS*		
				TB	EB	FD	P			A	MDL	
Quarterly	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	Mehlich I	Plant Available Phosphorus				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	Fe-oxide strip	Plant Available Phosphorus				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	EPA 365.1	Total P				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	EPA 9045c	pH				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	EPA 6010B	Extractable Al				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	EPA 6010B	Extractable Fe				
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	272	EPA 160.3	Total Solid				

TB - Trip Blank EB - Equipment Blank FD - Field duplicate P - Precision A - Accuracy MDL - Method Detection Limit
 *These values need to be completed if the Data Quality Objectives stated in the project description are different from the routine QA objectives cited in the CompQAP(s) or are not included in the CompQAP(s).

TABLE 3.2b

PROPOSED SAMPLES, MATRICES AND ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR THE PROJECT

FIELD SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES WILL BE PERFORMED BY THE ABOVE NAMED ORGANIZATION.

LABORATORY VEGETATION ANALYSES WILL BE PERFORMED BY: Southwest Florida Research Laboratory (UF-SWFL), whose CompQAP # is 950266 with annual amendments approved on 09/29/1999.

FREQUENCY	SAMPLE MATRIX	SAMPLE SOURCE	# SAMPLES	QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY			ANALYTICAL METHOD #	COMPONENT	QA TARGETS*		
				TB	EB	FD			P	A	MDL
Quarterly	Tissue extract	Tissue	570	n.m.	n/a	57	SM 4500-PE	Plant Phosphorus			
	Tissue extract	Tissue	570	n.m.	n/a	57	UF-IFAS SFRLT-AI	Total AI			
	Tissue extract	Tissue	570	n.m.	n/a	57	UF-IFAS SFRL DW	Dry Weight			

TB - Trip Blank EB - Equipment Blank FD - Field duplicate P - Precision A - Accuracy MDL - Method Detection Limit
 *These values need to be completed if the Data Quality Objectives stated in the project description are different from the routine QA objectives cited in the CompQAP(s) or are not included in the CompQAP(s).

TABLE 3.2c
PROPOSED SAMPLES, MATRICES AND ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR THE PROJECT

FIELD SAMPLE COLLECTION ACTIVITIES WILL BE PERFORMED BY THE ABOVE NAMED ORGANIZATION.

LABORATORY SOIL ANALYSES WILL BE PERFORMED BY: Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (UF-WBL), whose CompQAP # is 910051 with annual amendments approved on 04/07/2000.

FREQUENCY	SAMPLE MATRIX	SAMPLE SOURCE	# SAMPLES	QUALITY CONTROL SUMMARY				ANALYTICAL METHOD #	COMPONENT	QA TARGETS*	
				TB	EB	FD	P			A	MDL
Quarterly	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	68	Mehlich I	Plant Available Phosphorus	P	A	MDL
	Soil	Pasture	680	n.m.	n/a	68	EPA 9045c				

TB - Trip Blank EB - Equipment Blank FD - Field duplicate P - Precision A - Accuracy MDL - Method Detection Limit
 *These values need to be completed if the Data Quality Objectives stated in the project description are different from the routine QA objectives cited in the CompQAP(s) or are not included in the CompQAP(s).

Section 4.0 FIELD PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

This section specifies the protocols and procedures to be used by the **Southern DataStream Laboratory** when conducting sampling activities for this project.

4.1 Sampling Equipment

See Table 4.1 for a list of the equipment to be used for this project.

4.2 Field Activities - See Table 4.2.

4.2.1 Sampling protocols:

Sampling protocols for this project that are not specified by the CompQAP specified in Table 4.2 include the following: See Appendix A.

4.2.2 Disposal protocols:

Disposal protocols for handling wastes differ from those specified by the CompQAP. Wastes will be handled according to the following protocols: **N/A**

4.3 Field Measurements

Field measurements are listed in Table 3.2 of this QAPP.

TABLE 4.1
PROPOSED SAMPLING EQUIPMENT

The following equipment will be used by the **Southern DataStream Laboratory** for this project. With the exception of the additional equipment, discussions on use and restrictions are included in CompQAP# ?????? dated ??????.

Equipment Description	Construction Materials	Use
<i>Purging Equipment</i> (include construction of tubing, tail pipes, etc.)		
1. Peristaltic Pump	Vinyl Tubing (LPV)	Ground Water Collection
<i>Sampling Equipment</i>		
1. QED Post-filter 0.45 micron	Teflon	Ortho P Sample Filtration
2. Composite Sampler	HDPE bottles (5 gal)	Surface Water Collection
3. Dipper	HDPE	Surface Water Collection
4. Soil Auger	SS	Soil Sampling
Additional equipment not addressed in the CompQAP includes ¹ : Not applicable		
Field Measurement Equipment (construction does not need to be specified)		
1. pHTestr 2		
2. YSI 55 Dissolved Oxygen Meter		
3. TDSTestrs 3		
4. pH buffers (4, 7 and 10)		
5. Conductivity Standards 100 and 1000 uS/cm		

¹If the sampling protocols for using this equipment are not included in the cited CompQAP, the sampling protocols must be discussed in Section 4.2.1 of this Quality Assurance Project Plan.

TABLE 4.2

FIELD ACTIVITIES

The following field protocols will be used by the **Southern DataStream Laboratory**. The Comprehensive QA Plan number for this organization is _____ dated _____.

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan will be followed and are summarized below:

	VOCs	Extractable Organic	Metals	Inorganic Anion	Organic	Physical Property	Micro	Other
Groundwater				X		X		
Groundwater (in-place-plumbing)								
Potable Water								
Surface Water				X		X		
Soil								
Sediment/Sludges								
Automatic Samplers				X				
Field Filtration				X				
Wastewater								
Stormwater Runoff				X				
Pore Water/ Soil Extracts				X				

SAMPLE CONTAINERS

Sample containers will be supplied by the Southern DataStream Laboratory.

 Sample containers will be prepreserved by the above-referenced organization and additional acid will be provided; **OR**

 X Field organizations will preserve samples on site using protocols outlined in the CompQAP.

EQUIPMENT DECONTAMINATION

Equipment decontamination will follow protocols outlined in the **Southern DataStream Laboratory** CompQAP.*

EQUIPMENT SHALL BE PRECLINED PRIOR TO ON-SITE ARRIVAL

*** If more than one organization is involved with these activities, this QAPP must specifically identify the equipment and/or sample containers to be provided by each organization.**

WASTE DISPOSAL

 X The procedures for handling wastes from equipment cleaning and from sampling are discussed in the above-referenced CompQAP.

The disposal procedures for handling wastes for this project differ from those outlined in the above referenced CompQAP and are outlined in Section 4.2.2.

Section 5.0. LABORATORY PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

Southern DataStream Laboratory (SDSL)

Field parameters and samples collection shall be conducted by the **Southern DataStream Laboratory (SDSL)**.
CompQAP dated .

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan shall be followed. The laboratory shall analyze the samples for this project by the methods specified in Table 3.2 of the QAPP.

5.1 Quality Control Checks

The types of laboratory control checks that will be used when analyzing samples for this project are:

Chemical:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reagent Blanks	<input type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Samples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Samples
<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Matrix Spikes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing Calibration Standards	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Microbiology:

<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicates	<input type="checkbox"/> Control Blanks (MF)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carry over blanks (MF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution Blanks (MPN)
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive & Negative Controls	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Section 5.0 LABORATORY PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

Soil Chemistry Laboratory (UF-SCL)

The laboratory analyses for soils and residuals samples shall be conducted by the **UF-Soil Chemistry Laboratory (UF-SCL)**. CompQAP 970022 with annual amendments approved on 04/07/00.

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan shall be followed. The laboratory shall analyze the samples for this project by the methods specified in Table 3.2 of the QAPP.

5.1 Quality Control Checks

The types of laboratory control checks that will be used when analyzing samples for this project are:

Chemical:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reagent Blanks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Samples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Samples
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Matrix Spikes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing Calibration Standards	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Microbiology:

<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicates	<input type="checkbox"/> Control Blanks (MF)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carry over blanks (MF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution Blanks (MPN)
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive & Negative Controls	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Section 5.0. LABORATORY PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

Southwest Florida Research Laboratory (UF-SWFRL)

The laboratory analyses for vegetation samples shall be conducted by the **UF-IFAS Southwest Florida Research Laboratory (UF-IFAS SWFRL)**. CompQAP 950266 with annual amendments approved on 9/29/99.

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan shall be followed. The laboratory shall analyze the samples for this project by the methods specified in Table 3.2 of the QAPP.

5.1 Quality Control Checks

The types of laboratory control checks that will be used when analyzing samples for this project are:

Chemical:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reagent Blanks	<input type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Samples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Samples
<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Matrix Spikes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing Calibration Standards	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Microbiology:

<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicates	<input type="checkbox"/> Control Blanks (MF)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carry over blanks (MF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution Blanks (MPN)
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive & Negative Controls	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Section 5.0. LABORATORY PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (UF-WBL)

Laboratory analysis for site reconnaissance soil samples shall be conducted by the **Wetland Biogeochemistry Laboratory (UF-WBL)**. CompQAP 910051 with annual amendments approved on 8/02/00.

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan shall be followed. The laboratory shall analyze the samples for this project by the methods specified in Table 3.2 of the QAPP.

5.1 Quality Control Checks

The types of laboratory control checks that will be used when analyzing samples for this project are:

Chemical:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reagent Blanks	<input type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Samples	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Samples
<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Matrix Spikes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing Calibration Standards	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Microbiology:

<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicates	<input type="checkbox"/> Control Blanks (MF)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carry over blanks (MF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution Blanks (MPN)
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive & Negative Controls	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Section 5.0 LABORATORY PROCEDURES AND QUALITY CONTROL

Analytical Research Laboratory (UF-ARL)

The laboratory analyses for water samples shall be conducted by the **B. Analytical Research Laboratory (UF-ARL)**. CompQAP 900007G/5 with annual amendments approved on 6/01/00.

All protocols, procedures and policies in the above-mentioned document which are pertinent to this Quality Assurance Project Plan shall be followed. The laboratory shall analyze the samples for this project by the methods specified in Table 3.2 of the QAPP.

5.1 Quality Control Checks

The types of laboratory control checks that will be used when analyzing samples for this project are:

Chemical:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reagent Blanks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Matrix Spikes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Samples	<input type="checkbox"/> QC Check Samples
<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate Matrix Spikes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> QC Check Standards
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuing Calibration Standards	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: Method Blanks _____	

Microbiology:

<input type="checkbox"/> Duplicates	<input type="checkbox"/> Control Blanks (MF)
<input type="checkbox"/> Carry over blanks (MF)	<input type="checkbox"/> Dilution Blanks (MPN)
<input type="checkbox"/> Positive & Negative Controls	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____	

Section 6.0 QUALITY ASSURANCE MANAGEMENT

6.1 Corrective Actions

In addition to corrective actions cited in the approved Comprehensive QA Plans, **ALL INVOLVED PARTIES WILL INITIATE ANY CORRECTIVE ACTION DEEMED NECESSARY BY DEP.**

6.2 Performance and Systems Audits

6.2.1 Field activities:

Specific audits planned for this project are: **n/a**

6.2.2 Laboratory activities:

Specific audits planned for this project are: **n/a**

ALL INVOLVED PARTIES WILL CONSENT TO AUDITS BY DEP IF DEEMED NECESSARY.

6.3 Quality Assurance Reports

Project specific QA Reports will be submitted to Mr. Taufiqul Aziz, DEP, Bureau of Surface Water Management, 2600 Blair Stone Road, NS 2510, Tallahassee, FL 32399 – 2400 (Project Manager) and to the **DEP QA Section** at a frequency of once per quarter per Table 6 of 17-160, FAC, for direct contracts.

Note: Frequency must comply with Table V, Appendix D of the DEP Manual for Preparing Quality Assurance Plans or Table 6 of Chapter 62-160, F.A.C., Quality Assurance.

APPENDIX 1. Field Sampling and Protocols not in CompQAPs

Residuals Project Soil Samples

Sampling ¹

1. Sampling equipment will be decontaminated per Section 4.1 of the DEP SOP Manual.
2. Use a standard, stainless steel soil sampling tube to take the samples.
3. Remove one 20-cm long soil core, 2 cm in diameter.
4. Composite the cores in a paper bag and transport to the laboratory at ambient temperature for preparation.

Preparation

1. Dry the soil samples in paper bags in a heated drying room.
2. Pass the dried soil through a 1-mm diameter stainless steel screen to remove any small rocks, shells, or undecomposed pieces of organic matter.
3. Discard the debris, and return the screened soil to the paper bag for storage at ambient temperature.

Extraction of Phosphorus ²

1. Weigh 5.00 g of soil in a 50-mL extracting bottle.
2. Dispense 20 mL of Mehlich-1 extracting solution (0.0125 M H₂SO₄ and 0.050 M HCl) into each extracting bottle using an automatic pipette.
3. Shake each sample for 5 min. on a reciprocating shaker, then filter through an 11-cm, Whatman No. 42 filter paper into a 90 mL (3 oz) plastic cup.
4. Transfer the filtrate to a 20-mL plastic scintillation vial.

¹ From Citrus Grove Leaf-Tissue and Soil Testing: Sampling, Analysis, and Interpretation, by T. A. Obreza, A. K. Alva, E. A. Hanlon, and R. E. Rouse (Univ. of Florida-IFAS, Soil and Water Science Dept. Fact Sheet SL 115).

² From IFAS Extension Soil Testing Laboratory Chemical Procedures and Training Manual, by E. A. Hanlon, J. G. Gonzales, and J. M. Bartos (Univ. of Florida-IFAS Circular 812).

Appendix 2: CompQAP Example



COMPREHENSIVE QUALITY ASSURANCE PLAN

For

Southern DataStream Laboratory

P.O. Box 1577, LaBelle, Florida 33975

Dr. John C. Capece, SDSL Manager

Dr. Claudia Perlongo, SDSL QA Officer

October 1, 2000


**NOTE: DEP NOW REQUIRES ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION OF
COMPQAP...no hardcopy available**

PA Plan Elements

- 1.0 Key Personnel
- 2.0 SDSL Abilities – Sampling and Analytical
- 3.0 Sampling Equipment and Analytical Instrumentation

1.0 Key Personnel

Figure 1.1 Organization Chart



Appendix 3: FDEP Agricultural Use Permit Agricultural Use Plan

Part I - Facility Information

1. Facility Name _____

Facility Classification (check one from each column as appropriate)

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Domestic Wastewater Treatment Facility | <input type="checkbox"/> Type I | <input type="checkbox"/> New |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Residuals Management Facility | <input type="checkbox"/> Type II | <input type="checkbox"/> Existing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Septage Management Facility | <input type="checkbox"/> Type III | |

Facility ID _____

Contact Person _____ Title _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

2. Quantity of Residuals Generated Yearly _____ dry tons (1 ton = 2000 lb) Actual Estimated

3. Residuals Characteristics (annual arithmetic average):

Parameter	Units*	Ceiling Limits for Class A and B	Concentration	Parameter (continued)	Units*	Ceiling Limits for Class A and B	Concentration
Total Nitrogen	%	N/A		Copper	mg/kg	4300	
Total Phosphorus	%	N/A		Lead	mg/kg	840	
Total Potassium	%	N/A		Mercury	mg/kg	57	
Total Solids	%	N/A		Molybdenum	mg/kg	75	
pH	std. units	N/A		Nickel	mg/kg	420	
Arsenic	mg/kg	75		Selenium	mg/kg	100	
Cadmium	mg/kg	85		Zinc	mg/kg	7500	

*All units are in a dry weight basis except for total solids and pH. All sampling and analysis shall be conducted pursuant to Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 503.8, and the POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document.
N/A = not applicable

4. Pathogen Reduction Class Provided: A B (Rule 62-640.600(1), F.A.C)

Describe the pathogen reduction method used: _____

EPA Vector Attraction Reduction Option Used: (Rule 62-640.600(2), F.A.C.)

- | | | | | |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 7 | <input type="checkbox"/> 8 | <input type="checkbox"/> 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> 10 |

7. Using an appropriate map such as a USGS topographic map, determine site slope and attach documentation of the slope determination procedure used to demonstrate that land application zone slopes do not exceed 8 percent. If slopes exceed 2 percent in one or more land application zones, attach a Conservation Plan prepared by or approved by the Natural Resources Conservation Service or a stormwater management plan prepared in accordance with Chapter 62-25, F.A.C., by an engineer registered in Florida. The plan shall demonstrate that suitable soil infiltration rates and stormwater control measures exist at the site to retain runoff generated by the 10-year recurrence interval 1-hour duration storm event. Berms shall be placed for this purpose if necessary.
- Maximum Site Slope _____ %
8. If residuals will be stored temporarily (30 days or less) at the application site, describe the provisions for storage: _____
- If residuals will be stored for longer than 30 days (but not more than 2 years), attach documentation demonstrating that: a) the storage facilities at the site are adequate for the rates of residuals generation by permitted wastewater facilities sending residuals to the site; b) all of the residuals stored at the site, up to the capacity of the on-site storage facilities, can be land applied without resulting in an exceedence of cumulative loading limits or agronomic rates; and c) a longer storage period is needed because of agricultural operations or climatic factors at the site.
9. Describe the incorporation method and application technique to be used. _____
10. If "other solids" as defined in Rule 62-640.200, F.A.C., will be applied to the residuals application site, describe the intended beneficial use method of application: _____
11. Is this site located in an area identified by statute or by rule of the Department of Environmental Protection as being subject to restrictions on phosphorus loadings? Yes No
- If yes, attach: a) documentation of the characterization of soil phosphorus as determined by site-specific soil testing including results of initial soil testing performed before the first application of residuals to the site and a description of how subsequent soil testing will be accomplished after the completion of each crop cycles or growing seasons but before residuals are applied for the next crop cycle or growing season; b) a description of how the phosphorus content of all sources of phosphorus applied to the site will be accounted for in establishing residuals application rates at the site; c) a determination of the agricultural phosphorus needs of crops grown at the site; d) a description of the adequacy of measures that will be used to minimize or prevent water quality impacts that could result from sediment transport from residuals application areas to surface waters; and e) a description of the capacity of the soil to hold phosphorus.

Part III - Agricultural Site Information

1. Describe how the use of residuals on this site is part of planned agricultural operations.
- _____
- _____
2. Determine the maximum allowable residuals nitrogen application rate using the nitrogen demand of the site vegetation.
- a. Mark the following as appropriate:
- Basis for determination of nitrogen demand:
- Nitrogen loading table in Rule 62-640.750(2)(a), F.A.C.
- Recommendations of Natural Resources Conservation Service or Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (attach documentation)
- Other; identify (attach) _____
- Method used to determine maximum residuals nitrogen application rate:
- Rule 62-640.750(2)(b)1., F.A.C. - The calculation method in Chapter 7, Environmental Protection Agency, *Process Design Manual for Land Application of Sewage Sludge and Domestic Septage*.
- Rule 62-640.750(2)(b)2., F.A.C. - Other methods if approved by the Department.
- Enter the maximum residuals nitrogen application rate in the table in part b. Attach a sheet(s) showing the calculations performed for the rate as well as the other information entered in the table. Clearly indicate how the nitrogen assimilation rates are weighted for different crops grown on the same zones at the same time or consecutively. Also indicate how contributions of nitrogen from other applied sources are accounted for in the calculations.

b. Application Zone Information

Enter each zone in a separate column. Attach additional sheets if necessary. (Each application zone shall be clearly marked on the county section aerial map required in Part II, item 4.)

	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Column 4
Application zone ID #				
Acreage of application zone				
Crop(s) grown on application zone				
Nitrogen Demand in lbs/acre/year				
Maximum Residuals Nitrogen Application Rate in lbs/acre/year				
Maximum Residuals Phosphorus Application Rate in lbs/acre/year (if applicable)				
List the names of any other facilities that land apply residuals in each zone.				
Date of initial application*				
Cumulative metals loading to date for each zone in lbs/acre*				
Arsenic				
Cadmium				
Copper				
Lead				
Mercury				
Nickel				
Selenium				
Zinc				
Estimated remaining site life (years)				

*Baseline cumulative loading is calculated from all residuals applications to the zone beginning with the date of the first application subject to regulation by either Chapter 62-640, F.A.C., or Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 503, whichever is earlier (Rule 62-640.650(3)(b)3., F.A.C.).

Part IV - Reclamation Site Information (if applicable)

1. Describe the circumstances that have caused damage to the land and resulted in the need to perform land reclamation: _____

2. Describe the existing condition of the land: _____

3. Describe how the use of residuals on this site will be part of planned land reclamation activities. _____

4. Describe grading to be performed: (All site grading shall be completed before residuals application begins.) _____

5. Describe the method of incorporation into the soil that will be used: (The applied material shall be incorporated into the soil the same d application, except for Class A residuals.) _____

6. Describe the type of vegetation to be established and the schedule for planting: (Seed or turf-forming grass shall be planted as soon a possible, but in no case later than three months after the last application of residuals.) _____

7. Describe the anticipated application quantity (dry tons/acre): (The maximum allowable application quantity is 50 dry tons/acre with such application to be accomplished one time within a one-year period on any acre of the site.) _____

Part V - Certifications

Permittee

The permittee certifies that he/she is familiar with and shall comply with the applicable requirements of Chapter 62-640, F.A.C.; shall allow land application of his/her residuals only on a site for which an Agricultural Use Plan has been approved by the Department; and that the residuals to be land applied shall meet the general criteria in Rule 62-640.700(1), F.A.C. and shall be treated to the standards as identified in this plan. The permittee also certifies that he/she shall maintain a record of the total quantity of residuals land applied at this site and will file with the Department an annual summary of the residuals applied on this site, and that the residuals hauler and application site owner or manager have been made aware of the provisions of this rule.

Signature of Permittee

Title

Date

Site Owner

The site owner certifies that he/she has been provided a copy of Chapter 62-640, F.A.C., and that the site information provided in this plan is accurate to the best of his/her knowledge.

Signature of Site Owner

Date

INSTRUCTIONS FOR AGRICULTURAL USE PLAN

This form shall be completed in accordance with Chapter 62-640, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), and submitted to the appropriate Department District Office with the application for a wastewater permit for facilities which apply or intend to apply domestic wastewater residuals to land for agricultural or reclamation purposes. A form must be completed for each site where the facility's residuals will be land applied. If the application sites are modified or new application sites are to be used, a modified or new Agricultural Use Plan must be submitted with an application for a minor permit modification in accordance with Rule 62-640.300(2), F.A.C. All applicable items must be completed in full to avoid delay in processing. If attached sheets (or other technical documentation) are used in place of the blank space provided, refer to them in that space. All information is to be typed or printed in ink. Facilities which produce Class AA residuals in accordance with Rule 62-640.850, F.A.C., are not required to complete this form and Class AA residuals may be distributed and marketed under the provisions of Rule 62-640.850, F.A.C.

Part I - Facility Information.

Facility Name: Enter the name of the facility as it appears on the facility wastewater permit or permit application.

Facility Classification: Check one block from each column as applicable.

Facility ID: Enter the facility identification number as it appears on the facility wastewater permit.

Contact Person/Title/Phone/Fax: Enter the name and applicable information of the person who can be contacted for questions regarding the facility and this agricultural use plan.

Quantity of Residuals Generated Yearly: Enter the total quantity of residuals generated or expected to be generated by the facility on a yearly basis. Check whether the entered quantity is an actual observed amount or if it is an estimated amount. Residuals management facilities shall enter the amount of residuals that will be treated on a yearly basis.

Residuals Characteristics: Enter the arithmetic average for each parameter from the analyses of previous year of operation for an existing facility or the predicted concentrations of each parameter for a new facility. All units are in dry weight basis except for total solids and pH.

Pathogen Reduction Class Provided: Enter the pathogen reduction class provided by this facility. Choose only one.

Description of pathogen reduction method used: Briefly summarize the process used to achieve the above pathogen class. This should simply be abstracted from information submitted for the permittee's permit application or facility engineering report. A professional engineer's signature is not required for this entry.

Vector Attraction Option Used: Mark the VAR option used by this facility for its residuals. Choose only one from the table below.

Summary of Options for Meeting Vector Attraction Reduction	
Option Number	Description
1	Meet 38 percent reduction in volatile solids content.
2	Demonstrate vector attraction reduction with additional anaerobic digestion in a bench-scale unit.
3	Demonstrate vector attraction reduction with additional aerobic digestion in a bench-scale unit.
4	Meet a specific oxygen uptake rate for aerobically digested biosolids.
5	Use aerobic processes at greater than 40°C for 14 days or longer.
6	Alkali addition under specified conditions.
7	Dry biosolids with no unstabilized solids to at least 75 percent solids.
8	Dry biosolids with unstabilized solids to at least 90 percent solids.
9	Inject biosolids beneath the soil surface.
10	Incorporate biosolids into the soil within 6 hours of application to or placement on the land.

Note: Table is derived from Table 5-8, *A Plain English Guide to the EPA Part 503 Biosolids Rule*, EPA/832/R-93/003, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1993.

Part II - Residuals Site Information

Site Name: Enter the name of the site that this agricultural use plan describes.

Site Classification: Identify the site as an agricultural site or a land reclamation site.

Site Address/City/State/Zip: Enter the actual location address of the site.

Site Coordinates: Enter the latitude and longitude of the site in the degrees, minutes, seconds format. Use the centroid of the site.

Section/Township/Range/County: Enter the section, township, range, and county name. Section, township, and range can usually be found on a U.S.G.S. topographical map.

Road Directions to Site: Enter the driving directions necessary to visit the site.

Site Owner: Enter the legal name of the owner of the site.

Site Manager: Enter the site manager's name if the site is managed by someone other than the owner.

Owner/Manager Street Address/City/State/Zip/Phone/Fax: Enter the address and telephone information of the responsible person for the site.

Total Acreage of Site/Total Acreage to be Applied: First enter the entire acreage of the identified site, then enter the sum of the acreages of all the application zones that will be used by this facility. Enter the acreages of each individual application zone listed in the table in Part III, item 2.b.

Site pH: Enter the pH of the site's soil, tested in a location that is representative of application zone(s).

County Section Aerial Map with identification of site features: Provide the county section aerial map in a legible form with the indicated features clearly identified.

Site restrictions: Briefly describe the provisions made to ensure the site will meet the applicable site restrictions in Rule 62-640.600(3), F.A.C.

Seasonal high ground water level: The ground water level shall not be within two feet of the soil surface when applying residuals. Natural Resource Conservation Service Maps may be used to indicate that the seasonal high ground water level is not within two feet of the ground surface. Otherwise, the ground water level shall be tested prior to application. Briefly describe what provisions will be made for any residuals that would have been applied if the test reveals that the ground water level is within two feet of the soil surface.

Maximum site slope: Determine the site's maximum slope. It may not exceed 8 percent and if greater than 2 percent, a conservation plan must be attached.

Residuals storage: Briefly describe any provisions for temporary storage of residuals at the site.

Incorporation and application methods: Briefly describe the intended method of incorporation of the residuals into the soil (if any) and method of application.

Other Solids If "other solids" are to be applied to the site, briefly describe the intended beneficial use.

Phosphorus sensitive areas: If the site is located in an area that has been identified by the Florida Legislature as being subject to restrictions on phosphorus loadings, the plan must address the information described in Rule 62-640.500(4), F.A.C.

Part III - Agricultural Site Information:

Description of residuals use in agricultural operations: Briefly describe how residuals will be used in the agricultural operations of the site.

Determination of maximum residuals nitrogen application rate: Identify the basis for the nitrogen demand and any adjustments. Attach a sheet showing the actual calculations performed to determine the maximum allowable residuals nitrogen application rate. Enter the determined rates in the following table containing application zone information.

Application Zone Information - (table)

Application zone ID#: Each application zone shall have an alphanumeric identification (i.e. 1, 1A, or A, etc.) that will distinguish it from the other application zones at the site. This identification will stay with the application zone indefinitely since the application records and cumulative metals loading will be tracked by this identification number.

Application zone acreage: Enter each application zone's acreage.

Crop(s): Enter the primary crop(s) grown on each zone.

Nitrogen Demand: Enter the nitrogen demand in lb./acre/year based on the crop(s) grown on each zone.

Maximum Residuals Nitrogen Application Rate in lb/acre/year: Enter the rate determined in Part III, item 2, part a, for each zone.

Maximum Residuals Phosphorus Application Rate in lb/acre/year: Enter the rate if the zone is located in an area identified by the Florida Legislature as being subject to restrictions on phosphorus loadings.

List of any other facilities that land apply residuals in each zone: List the names of any other parties who land apply residuals to this application zone.

Date of first regulated application: Enter the date that the tracking of the cumulative metals loading started. The tracking of cumulative metals loading starts with the first application of residuals that was/is subject to regulation by either Chapter 62-640, F.A.C., or Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations Part 503, whichever is earlier.

Cumulative metals loading to date for each zone: Enter the calculated cumulative loading of each of the listed metals for each zone.

Estimated remaining site life: Enter the estimated remaining site life for each zone based on the expected annual metal loadings to the zone.

Part IV - Reclamation Site Information

Need for land reclamation: Briefly describe the background of how the land became damaged and the need for land reclamation.

Existing condition of the land: Briefly describe the current condition of the site.

Residuals and land reclamation activities: Briefly describe how residuals will be used in the land reclamation operations.

Grading: Briefly describe what grading will be needed on the site.

Method of Incorporation: Briefly describe how the residuals will be incorporated into the soil. This shall be done on the same day as application for Class B residuals.

Vegetation: Briefly describe what vegetation will be planted on the site and the schedule.

Application quantity: Give the expected quantity of residuals that will be applied to the site in dry tons/acre (1 ton = 2000 lb).

Part V - Certifications

Each party shall sign in the appropriate sections and enter the date of signature.

A professional engineer's signature is not required for the AUP. A professional engineer's signature may be required on applicable attached documentation to the AUP. For example, if the site slopes exceed 2 percent and a stormwater management plan is submitted that was prepared in accordance with Chapter 62-25, F.A.C., by an engineer registered in Florida, then the engineer's signature is required on the stormwater management plan.