





# NH<sub>3</sub> Losses Following Soil-Surface Application of Poultry Manures in Eastern Canada

Ezequiel Miola<sup>(1)</sup>, Philippe Rochette<sup>(2)</sup>; Denis Angers<sup>(2)</sup>; Martin Chantigny<sup>(2)</sup>; Marc-Olivier Gasser<sup>(3)</sup>; David Pelster<sup>(2)</sup>; Normand Bertrand<sup>(2)</sup>; Celso Aita<sup>(1)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> Federal University of Santa Maria, Santa Maria, Brazil; <sup>(2)</sup> AAFC, Quebec City, Canada; <sup>(3)</sup> IRDA, Québec City, Canada

# INTRODUCTION

- ✓ In Canada, land application of poultry manure results in the volatilization of 10.8 Gg NH<sub>3</sub>-N annually (Sheppard and Bittman, 2013);
- $\checkmark$  NH<sub>3</sub> emissions from surface-applied poultry manure may be influenced by previous manure handling and storage;
- $\checkmark$  There are few reports of relationships between field NH<sub>3</sub> emissions and poultry ammoniacal N (TAN), dry matter and pH manure characteristics: total



(Misselbrook et al., 2005a); pH (Lau et al., 2010).

# **OBJECTIVES**

Quantify NH<sub>3</sub> losses from several poultry manure types commonly found in  $\checkmark$ 

Eastern Canada, and relate  $NH_3$  emissions to manure TAN applied.

# MATERIAL AND METHODS

- Site: Québec City, Canada (lat. 46°05'N, long. 71°02'W, elevation 110 m);
- **Period:** 6 to 28 August 2012;
- **Soil:** Loamy Typic Humaquept (30% sand, 19% clay);
- Experimental design: Randomized complete block with three replicates;
- **NH<sub>3</sub> emission measurement:** Wind tunnels (Lockyer, 1984);  $\checkmark$
- **Treatments:** Seven different poultry manures;
- **Application rate:** 20 g total N m<sup>-2</sup>

$(  N_1 - ()1)$	

Manure-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (g N m<sup>-2</sup>)

Manure-NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup> (g N m<sup>-2</sup>)

Figure 1. Cumulative NH<sub>3</sub> losses (a), NH<sub>3</sub> emissions as a fraction of manure total N (TN) and total ammoniacal N (TAN) applied (b), cumulative  $NH_3$  losses vs TAN applied in this study (c) and for the summary of literature data on poultry manures (d). (LM: Layer Manure, BL: Broiler Litter, O: Old, Y: Young, D: Dry)

Table 3. Time after manure application when  $NH_3$  losses reached 5 to 75% of total emissions

5%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	75%



### Table 1. Selected characteristics of the poultry manures (wet basis).

Trootmonto+	рΗ	Dry Matter	NH <sub>4</sub> +-N	NO <sub>3</sub> ⁻-N	Organic N	Total N	Total C	C/N	
Treatments <sup>1</sup>	(%) g kg <sup>-1</sup>								
LM-O1	7.9	61.4	5.6	0.0	35.3	40.9	189.1	4.6	
LM-O2	8.4	43.5	13.9	0.0	12.9	26.8	129.2	4.8	
LM-Y	8.0	37.0	6.0	0.0	18.5	24.5	120.6	4.9	
LM-YD1	7.9	94.9	0.7	0.0	36.3	37.0	315.1	8.5	
LM-YD2	7.1	69.9	2.3	0.0	33.7	36.0	235.2	6.5	
BL-O	8.5	51.9	3.2	0.0	14.6	17.8	178.8	10.1	
BL-Y	8.4	64.8	4.0	0.1	19.6	23.7	266.6	11.2	

<sup>†</sup> LM: Layer Manure, BL: Broiler Litter, O: Old, Y: Young, D: Dry.

### Table 2. Details of the poultry manure handling and storage.

Treatmen	ts <sup>†</sup> Description
LM-O1	Layer manure, old, compact, stockpiled for more than 7 months in a closed shed.
LM-O2	Layer manure, old, stockpiled wet: 4 months on a concrete platform followed by 40 d in the field.
LM-Y	Layer manure, young, stored beneath the cages and removed twice a week.
LM-YD1	Layer manure, young, droppings were dried with an efficient system within 24 h, and then stockpiled

Time after manure application (h)							
1.4	3.5	12.3	30.3	61.2	108.3	270.0	
0.6	0.9	1.9	4.2	9.0	18.3	97.0	
0.7	1.0	2.3	4.8	9.8	19.8	104.8	
25.8	124.7	168.3	177.2	187.3	199.5	254.5	
22.8	109.7	173.8	183.8	195.0	208.0	257.7	
0.0	0.0	0.1	0.4	2.2	9.0	115.8	
0.4	1.3	6.2	19.3	47.5	99.7	231.2	
	1.4 0.6 0.7 25.8 22.8 0.0 0.4	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Time after1.43.512.30.60.91.90.71.02.325.8124.7168.322.8109.7173.80.00.00.10.41.36.2	Time after manure app1.43.512.330.30.60.91.94.20.71.02.34.825.8124.7168.3177.222.8109.7173.8183.80.00.00.10.40.41.36.219.3	Time after manure application (h)1.43.512.330.361.20.60.91.94.29.00.71.02.34.89.825.8124.7168.3177.2187.322.8109.7173.8183.8195.00.00.00.10.42.20.41.36.219.347.5	Time after manure application (h)1.43.512.330.361.2108.30.60.91.94.29.018.30.71.02.34.89.819.825.8124.7168.3177.2187.3199.522.8109.7173.8183.8195.0208.00.00.00.10.42.29.00.41.36.219.347.599.7	

<sup>†</sup> LM: Layer Manure, BL: Broiler Litter, O: Old, Y: Young, D: Dry.

## CONCLUSIONS

- $\checkmark$  NH<sub>3</sub> losses accounted for 13.6 to 35% of TN;
- $\checkmark$  Linear regressions between cumulative NH<sub>3</sub> losses and applied TAN explained 85, 92 and 84% for the first 26 h, 7 d and 22 d, respectively;
- $\checkmark$  Literature data indicates that, on average, 36% of poultry manure TAN is lost
  - as NH<sub>3</sub> with a contribution of other NH<sub>4</sub> sources estimated at 0.41 g NH<sub>3</sub> m<sup>-2</sup>;
- ✓ Incorporation of dried manures (LM-YD1 and LM-YD2) can wait until first
  - rainfall. Omitting the dried manures, the mean incorporation delay to limit

#### for 20 d in a closed shed.



#### **BL-O** Broiler litter with wood shavings, old, stockpiled for more than 7 months in a closed shed.

#### **BL-Y** Broiler litter with wood shavings, young, stockpiled for 5 d in the field.

<sup>+</sup> LM: Layer Manure, BL: Broiler Litter, O: Old, Y: Young, D: Dry.



### $\checkmark$ NH<sub>3</sub> losses using semi-open chambers = 30% of wind tunnels estimates.

Lau et al. (2008) Can. Biosyst. Engin. 50:647-655; Lockyer (1984) J. Sci. Food Agric. 35:837-848; Lockyer (1989) Environ. Pollut. 56:19-30; Sharpe et al. (2004) J. Environ. Qual. 33:1183-1188; Marshall et al. (1998) J. Environ. Qual. 27: 1125-1129; Misselbrook, et al. (2005a) Bioresour. Technol. 96:159-168; Misselbrook, et al. (2005b) Environ. Pollut. 135:389-397; Rodhe and Karlsson (2002) Biosyst. Engin. 82:455-462; Sheppard and Bittman (2013) Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 171:90-10.