

**TEMPORAL SODIUM FLUX IN A WOODLOT SOIL  
IRRIGATED WITH SECONDARY TREATED EFFLUENT:  
THE IMPLICATIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE IRRIGATION  
AND SOIL MANAGEMENT**

by

Steven Lucas

B.Sc (Hons) (University of Newcastle)

February 2007

A Thesis submitted for the  
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

in the  
School of Environmental & Life Sciences,  
The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia



## ***CERTIFICATION***

I, Steven Andrew Lucas, certify that the substance of this thesis has not been submitted for any degrees and is not currently being submitted for any other degree or qualification. I certify that any assistance received in preparing this thesis, and all sources used, have been acknowledged in this thesis.

.....

Steven Andrew Lucas

.....

Date

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

During this thesis, many people provided the necessary inspiration, support and encouragement needed for me to reach this point. Firstly, I especially wish to thank my family (Mum, Dad, Tim and Tayla) for having perseverance and faith in me, for they were the real “wind beneath my wings” and without them this would not have been possible. I truly was blessed with such family support that my heart overflows with love and gratitude, but a million pages is not enough space to put it into words.

Secondly, deep appreciation and thanks go to my supervisors, Phillip Geary and Russell Drysdale, who provided timely words of wisdom and kept me level-headed over the past five years. They both contributed significantly to the gaining of an Australian Research Council (ARC) (APIA) Grant, of which I was the recipient and I thank Phillip, Russell and the ARC for this opportunity. Both Phillip and Russell spent much time reviewing drafts of conference papers, progress reports and the thesis itself and for this I am also grateful.

I am also grateful to the School of Environmental and Life Sciences administration staff, particularly Margaret Lane and the late Sharon Francis, who sorted conference payments, bookings, general administration and all those little things that make the big things easier, over a long period of time. Thanks to Chris Dever and Peter Loughran for all the laboratory and field assistance during this time, and to Olivier Rey Lescure for the location Figures in this thesis. For other words of encouragement during this thesis, I thank Dr Greg Hancock, Dr Stuart Pearson, Dr Kate Hartig and Associate Professor Peter Coombes.

Special thanks also to Dave O'Brien, whose editing and comments on very early drafts provided the confidence to keep the thesis evolving. My appreciation goes to all the people that contributed in other ways. The Hunter Water Corporation (HWC) for providing the study site and initial funding for the project, particularly Derek Orrin and Wendy Yeomans.

To all the staff at Allied Testing Pty Ltd, particularly Michael Campbell and Dennis Hafey, for allowing use of the ICP-AES and providing casual employment over the past six years, I owe you a great degree of thanks.

Last, but by no means least, I thank ALL my friends. Thanks for the social distractions preventing me from cranial meltdown. The open highway, waves surfed, fish caught (and lost!), beers drunk and moments shared were priceless and should be an integral part of any thesis attempt.

## ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS AND SYMBOLS

Abbreviation	Term
$\Delta$	symbol prefix for “change in “
$\theta$	volumetric soil moisture
$\theta_g$	gravimetric soil moisture
cmol(+)/kg	centimole per kilogram pertaining to cationic charge
$C_{TH}$	threshold concentration
$C_{TU}$	turbidity concentration
CEC	cation exchange capacity
CI	confidence interval
C	final concentration (solubility curves)
$C_o$	initial concentration (solubility curves)
D	deep drainage
DDL	diffuse double layer theory
EAT	Emerson Aggregate Test
EC	electrical conductivity (dS/m)
EP	equivalent populations
ESP	Exchangeable Sodium Percentage
$\Delta ESP$	change in soil ESP
ET	evapotranspiration
FC	field capacity
$\Delta I$	irrigation surplus/deficit
$\Delta CI$	cumulative irrigation surplus/deficit
ICP-AES	inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometer
IL	interception loss
$K_{sat}$	saturated hydraulic conductivity
meq/L	milliequivalent per litre
mmol/L	millimole per litre
OS	outside solution
PET	potential evapotranspiration

PVC	polyvinylchloride
$Q_p$	precipitation
$Q_e$	applied effluent
R	runoff
$R_d$	retardation factor (solubility curves)
RSD	relative standard deviation
SAR	Sodium Adsorption Ratio
$SAR_p$	Sodium Adsorption Ratio for soil in 1:5 distilled water
STE	secondary treated effluent
WP	wilting point
WWTW	wastewater treatment works

# CONTENTS

<b>1. INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Thesis approach and structure	4
<b>2. BACKGROUND</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Introduction	6
2.2 Physical and chemical behaviour of irrigated soils	6
2.2.1 Salinity and sodicity	6
2.2.2 Sodium in the soil profile	8
2.2.3 The Exchangeable Sodium Percentage (ESP) and Sodium Adsorption Ratio (SAR)	9
2.2.4 Charged soil particles, micro-aggregate stability and electrolyte concentration	10
2.2.5 Soil permeability in relation to the threshold concentration ( $C_{TH}$ ) and turbidity concentration ( $C_{TU}$ )	18
2.2.6 Solute transport in soil water	24
2.2.7 Implications of changing soil ESP and changing effluent SAR for micro-aggregate/soil pore stability	25
2.2.8 Electrolyte concentration and SAR – understanding the relationship for managing effluent irrigated woodlots	29
2.3 Effluent irrigation of woodlots	30
2.3.1 Effluent characteristics	30
2.3.2 Effluent irrigation principles	31
2.3.3 Hydraulic and nutrient loading	33
2.4 Summary	40

<b>3</b>	<b>SITE DESCRIPTION AND EXISTING DATA</b>	<b>43</b>
3.1	Introduction	43
3.2	Location and topography	43
3.3	Tree species planted	46
3.4	Climate	46
3.5	Groundwater	47
3.6	Geology and soil description	47
3.7	Soil ESP and hydraulic loading from past monitoring	49
<b>4</b>	<b>METHODS</b>	<b>51</b>
4.1	Introduction	51
4.2	Field methods	51
4.2.1	Measurements of water balance components	51
4.2.2	Applied effluent ( $Q_e$ ) and Precipitation ( $Q_p$ )	53
4.2.3	Evapotranspiration (as PET)	53
4.2.4	Interception loss (IL)	54
4.2.5	Runoff (R)	55
4.2.6	Deep drainage (D)	55
4.2.7	Groundwater	56
4.2.8	Soil component - site selection and soil sampling	59
4.2.9	Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ )	62
4.3	Laboratory methods	63
4.3.1	Effluent, rainwater and groundwater analyses	63
4.3.2	Soil analyses	64
4.3.3	Calculation of sodium loading	66
4.3.4	Soil bulk density	68
4.3.5	Soil moisture curves	69
4.3.6	Column leaching experiments	70
4.4	Summary	74



<b>5 RESULTS</b>	<b>75</b>
5.1 Introduction	75
5.2 Results of field measurements	76
5.2.1 Water balance components	76
5.2.2 Applied effluent ( $Q_e$ ) and precipitation ( $Q_p$ )	78
5.2.3 Potential Evapotranspiration (PET) and cumulative irrigation surplus/deficit	79
5.2.4 Groundwater	83
5.2.5 Soil survey results – site selection and soil sampling	86
5.2.6 Site specific volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ )	89
5.2.7 Average weekly $\theta$ of all sites within woodlot	101
5.3 Results of laboratory measurements	103
5.3.1 Effluent and rainwater analyses	103
5.3.2 Groundwater analyses	104
5.3.3 Soil analyses - temporal soil ESP, $\Delta$ ESP, change in sodium (cmol(+)/kg at specific sites	107
5.3.4 Soil analyses – comparison of temporal soil ESP between similar sites	126
5.3.5 Temporal variation in cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^{+}$ and $\text{K}^{+}$ ), cation exchange capacity (CEC) and clay mineralogy	129
5.3.6 Sodium loading	139
5.3.7 Bulk density	141
5.3.8 Soil moisture retention curves	141
5.4 Column-leaching experiments	144
5.4.1 Column-leaching in relation to the CTU and CTH	144
5.4.2 Column-leaching by depth	146

5.5	The Soil ESP/Effluent SAR continuum for micro-aggregate/soil pore stability	153
5.6	Summary	158

## **6 DISCUSSION 159**

6.1	Introduction	159
6.2	Effluent Irrigation Scheduling	160
6.2.1	Effluent and rainfall chemistry	163
6.2.2	Groundwater	163
6.2.3	Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ )	164
6.2.4	Soil moisture curves	165
6.3	Temporal soil ESP	166
6.3.1	Site comparisons: irrigated versus non-irrigated sites	168
6.3.2	Sodium loading	174
6.3.3	Interpretation of temporal variations in monitored parameters	175
6.4	Implications for managing effluent irrigated woodlots	188
6.4.1	Column leaching experiments	188
6.4.2	The soil ESP/effluent SAR continuum and the Emerson Aggregate Test	194
6.4.3	Hypothetical application of the continuum	195
6.4.4	Application of the continuum to this study	196
6.4.5	Recommended strategy for managing sodium flux	202

## **7. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH 206**

## **8. REFERENCES 212**

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Raw water balance data

Appendix B: Raw class A pan evaporation data

Appendix C: Average volumetric moisture data and statistics

Appendix D: Raw volumetric moisture data (all sites)

Appendix E: Raw soil data

Appendix F: Groundwater depth

Appendix G: Raw groundwater/effluent data

Appendix H: Raw column leaching experiment data (0 – 10 cm)

Appendix I: Raw column leaching experiment data (10 – 20 cm)

Appendix J: X-ray diffraction analyses

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1: Possible arrangements of clay domains, organic polymers and quartz grains in a micro-aggregate (after White 1997)	12
Figure 2.2: Inter-crystalline or domain swelling of a Ca-saturated clay (after White 1997)	13
Figure 2.3: 3-plate model of a clay domain (after Quirk 2001)	14
Figure 2.4: Comparison of particle arrangements in a homoionic Na-montmorillinite with that in a Ca-Na system illustrating the formation of clay domains with “demixing” (after Sumner, 1993)	16
Figure 2.5: Plate stacking arrangements in Na <sup>+</sup> clay and Ca <sup>2+</sup> clay (after McBride 1994)	16
Figure 2.6: Permeability as a function of electrolyte concentration and ESP (after Davidson and Quirk (1961), modified from Quirk, 2001)	19
Figure 2.7: A highly acidic soil with leached cations (Ca <sup>2+</sup> , Mg <sup>2+</sup> , Na <sup>+</sup> , K <sup>+</sup> ) and associated clay particle response	21
Figure 2.8: An agriculturally “productive” soil with a balance of cations and associated soil response	22
Figure 2.9: A sodium-dominated soil profile and subsequent response of clay particles	23
Figure 2.10: Edge-to-face flocculation of kaolinite at low pH (after White, 1997)	26
Figure 2.11: The main components of the water balance in an effluent irrigated woodlot (from Myers <i>et al.</i> , 1999)	33
Figure 2.12: Theoretical soil water management regime in an effluent irrigated woodlot (from Myers <i>et al.</i> , 1999)	36
Figure 2.13: The probable sodium flux in an effluent irrigated woodlot	38
Figure 2.14: Example of a plotted annual soil sampling/monitoring assessment	39

Figure 2.15: Example of a plotted soil sampling/monitoring assessment based on two-monthly soil sampling	40
Figure 3.1: Location of study site	44
Figure 3.2: (a) General layout of the Branxton Waste Water Treatment Works (WWTW) and irrigated woodlots, and (b) Area 3 showing past monitoring sites (groundwater bores and soil sampling sites (4, 6 and 7)) and treated areas (lime addition)	45
Figure 3.3: Generic soil profile and description - Branxton woodlot (Area 3)	48
Figure 3.4: Temporal soil ESP at selected sites within Area 3 – from past reports	49
Figure 3.5: Annual rainfall and effluent applied to Area 3 at the Branxton WWTW (1992 – 2003) and the percentage of the total effluent generated by the WWTW that was applied to Area 3 (1.32 ha)	50
Figure 4.1: Methods summary flowchart	52
Figure 4.2: A case of a point-piezometer (after Hudak, 1999)	57
Figure 4.3: Schematic of bore-hole showing parameters used for Hvorslev Method	58
Figure 4.4: 3-point method for determining groundwater direction and hydraulic gradient	59
Figure 4.5: Area 3 woodlot - soil sampling sites, soil moisture sampling sites and groundwater bore locations	61
Figure 4.6: Gopher soil moisture profiling system	62
Figure 4.7: Sodium pathways in an effluent irrigated woodlot, assuming negligible sub-surface lateral movement	67
Figure 4.8: Set-up of column leaching experiments (CLE)	72
Figure 4.9: Solute breakthrough curves (C/Co) (after Hudak, 1999)	73
Figure 5.1: Comparison of cumulative irrigation surplus/deficit and WATSKED trends ( $r^2 = 0.92$ )	77

Figure 5.2: Depth of effluent and rainfall applied (January 2002 – October 2003)	78
Figure 5.3: PET between January 2002 and October 2003	80
Figure 5.4: Daily irrigation surplus/deficit between January 2002 – October 2003	81
Figure 5.5: $\Delta$ SWS between January 2002 and October 2003 with table showing surplus (+) and deficit (-) periods (1 – 7), period date and difference during periods	82
Figure 5.6: Depth to groundwater monitored on a weekly basis (May 2002 – November 2003)	84
Figure 5.7: Groundwater flow through Area 3, Branxton WWTW	86
Figure 5.8: Observed horizon boundaries and textures of sampled Sampled sites at the Branxton WWTW	87
Figure 5.9: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S1 (January 2002 – October 2003)	89
Figure 5.10: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S2 (January 2002 – October 2003)	91
Figure 5.11: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S4 (January 2002 – October 2003)	92
Figure 5.12: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S5 (January 2002 – October 2003)	93
Figure 5.13: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S6 (January 2002 – October 2003)	94
Figure 5.14: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S8 (January 2002 – October 2003)	95
Figure 5.15: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S9 (January 2002 – October 2003)	96
Figure 5.16: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S10 (January 2002 – October 2003)	97

Figure 5.17: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S12 (January 2002 – October 2003)	98
Figure 5.18: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S13 (January 2002 – October 2003)	99
Figure 5.19: Volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) at S14 (January 2002 – October 2003)	100
Figure 5.20: Weekly volumetric soil moisture ( $\theta$ ) – averaged from nine sites (January 2002 – October 2003)	101
Figure 5.21: The volume-weighted average SAR of applied STE and rainfall between June 2002 and October 2003	104
Figure 5.22 (A – C): Groundwater summary analyses: (A) pH; (B) EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ); (C) SAR (June 2002 – November 2003)	105
Figure 5.22 D: Ternary plot for measured groundwater cations (June 2002 – November 2003)( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^{+}$ )	107
Figure 5.23: (A) pH versus Exchange Acidity (EA); and (B) ESP (no EA) versus ESP (with EA)	108
Figure 5.24: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S1 (February 2002 – October 2003)	110
Figure 5.25: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S5 (February 2002 – October 2003)	113
Figure 5.26: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S8 (February 2002 – October 2003)	115
Figure 5.27: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S9 (February 2002 – October 2003)	119
Figure 5.28: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S10 (February 2002 – October 2003)	122
Figure 5.29: Soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ at S14 (February 2002 – October 2003)	124
Figure 5.30: Average soil ESP and $\Delta\text{ESP}$ for all sites within the woodlot (S1, S5, S8, S10) (February 2002 – October 2003)	127
Figure 5.31: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^{+}$ and $\text{K}^{+}$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S1	131

Figure 5.32: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^+$ and $\text{K}^+$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S5	132
Figure 5.33: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^+$ and $\text{K}^+$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S8	133
Figure 5.34: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^+$ and $\text{K}^+$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S9	134
Figure 5.35: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^+$ and $\text{K}^+$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S10	135
Figure 5.36: Change in molar concentration of cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ , $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ , $\text{Na}^+$ and $\text{K}^+$ in $\text{cmol}(+)/\text{kg}$ ) and cation exchange capacity (CEC) with depth for S14	136
Figure 5.37: Soil ESP versus molar ratios of Ca/Mg, Na/Mg and Ca/Na	138
Figure 5.38: Monthly sodium loading (June 2002 – October 2003)	140
Figure 5.39: Soil moisture curve for the representative sample (0 – 20 cm)	142
Figure 5.40: Soil moisture curve for the representative sample (40 – 60 cm)	143
Figure 5.41: Soil moisture curve for the representative sample (80 – 100 cm)	143
Figure 5.42: Column leaching in relation to the $C_{\text{TU}}$ and $C_{\text{TH}}$ , showing a stable irrigated soil (column 1, SAR of application waters $>C_{\text{TH}}$ ) and an irrigated soil where dispersion has taken place (column 1, SAR of application waters $<C_{\text{TU}}$ )	145
Figure 5.43 (A – C): Column leaching experiments: A – variations in pH; B – variations in EC ( $\mu\text{S}/\text{cm}$ ); C – variations in SAR over time in column leaching experiments	149



Figure 5.43 (D – F): Column leaching experiments: D – variations in $K_s$ ; E – variations in turbidity (NTU); F – C/Co curves over time in column leaching experiments	150
Figure 5.44: Soil ESP/Effluent SAR continuum for micro-aggregate/soil pore stability	155
Figure 5.45: Effluent/rainfall SAR versus electrolyte concentration	157
Figure 6.1: Summary of soil ESP and $\theta$ for S1, S8 and S14 (soils with loamy sand A and B horizons)	170
Figure 6.2: Summary of soil ESP and $\theta$ for S5, S10 and S9 (soils with sandy clay B horizons)	171
Figure 6.3: Cumulative irrigation surplus/deficit between January 2002 and October 2003 highlighting wetting and drying trends	177
Figure 6.5: The volume-weighted average SAR of applied STE and rainfall (June 2002 and October 2003) and the Average soil ESP and $\Delta$ ESP for all sites within the woodlot (S1, S5, S8, S10) (February 2002 – October 2003)	178
Figure 6.6: Applied effluent; Rainfall; Depth to groundwater monitored on a weekly basis (May 2002 – November 2003); and Monthly sodium loading (June 2002 – October 2003)	179
Figure 6.7: Branxton woodlot (S1 - Area 3) – $C_{TU}$ and $C_{TH}$ versus the volume-weighted average SAR of application waters Jun02 – Oct03	197
Figure 6.8: Branxton woodlot (S5 - Area 3) – $C_{TU}$ and $C_{TH}$ versus the volume-weighted average SAR of application waters Jun02 – Oct03	197
Figure 6.9: Branxton woodlot (S8 - Area 3) – $C_{TU}$ and $C_{TH}$ versus the volume-weighted average SAR of application waters Jun02 – Oct03	198
Figure 6.10: Branxton woodlot (S10 - Area 3) – $C_{TU}$ and $C_{TH}$ versus the volume-weighted average SAR of application waters Jun02 – Oct03	198
Figure 6.11: Flow diagram for irrigation scheduling to minimise the frequency of soil dispersion events	203

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: Relative difference in Debye length between Na and Ca electrolytes (after Quirk, 2001)	13
Table 2.2: Chemical characteristics of low strength STE (after Myers <i>et al.</i> , 1999)	30
Table 4.1: Methods for water analyses (effluent, rainfall and groundwater)	64
Table 4.2: Soil analysis methods (after Rayment and Higginson, 1992)	65
Table 5.1: Pan co-efficients showing assumed variation in transpiration for each month	81
Table 5.2: Slug-injection data – summary	86
Table 5.3: Effluent/rainfall chemical analyses from monthly analysis	103
Table 5.4: Salinity of groundwater in 718 bores in the Hunter Valley (after Beale <i>et al.</i> , 2000)	107
Table 5.5: Duplicate sampling during October 2002 at S8 to determine at-a-site variability	117
Table 5.6: 95 % Confidence Intervals (CI) for soil ESP values – top graph of Figure 5.30	128
Table 5.7: Average soil ESP for irrigated/non-irrigated Loamy Sand and Average soil ESP for irrigated/non-irrigated Loamy Sand (A horizon)/Sandy Clay (B horizon)	129
Table 5.8: Bulk density data summary and results	141
Table 5.9: Solute transport medium chemical parameters as used for CLE	147
Table 5.10: Solute exchange medium chemical parameters as used for CLE, showing before/after results of each depth fraction	147

## ABSTRACT

This study reports results obtained and the approach taken in investigating the temporal sodium flux in a woodlot soil receiving secondary treated effluent at Branxton, NSW. Previous research has shown woodlot soils receiving secondary treated effluent undergo an increase in exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP) over time. Increased soil ESP influences micro-aggregate/soil pore stability and, particularly when subject to irrigation waters of specific low-electrolyte concentrations, results in decreased soil permeability and a subsequent need to reduce effluent application rates.

Therefore, in irrigated woodlot soils it has been necessary to implement strategies to remove excess sodium from the root zone to maintain optimum permeability of the receiving soil, that is, maintaining the cation balance (as soil ESP) to promote optimum soil pore size. To maintain optimum permeability, an understanding is needed of temporal variations in the accumulation/leaching (flux) of sodium within a soil under secondary treated effluent irrigated conditions. The ability to define the sodium flux depends on the frequency of soil sampling and the ability to interpret the net loss/gain in soil sodium in relation to the applied hydraulic load over time. Past research has measured changes in soil ESP on an annual basis, or longer, making it impossible to interpret temporal sodium flux within a given year.

The rate of change of soil ESP has ramifications for optimum permeability within an effluent irrigated woodlot. With respect to increasing/decreasing soil ESP, a major response of the clay particles within micro-aggregates is the deformation of conducting soil pores and reduced hydraulic conductivities. In addition, clay dispersion is governed by the soil ESP and electrolyte concentration of the infiltrating waters at the time, where dispersed clay particles may block conducting soil pores and further reduce hydraulic conductivity. Therefore, investigating the temporal sodium flux in conjunction with the temporal variation in electrolyte concentration of infiltrating waters will give greater insight into the response of effluent irrigated soils to sodium-rich waters over time.

Three research aims were formed to investigate temporal sodium flux. These include:

1. To investigate trends in the dominant water balance components for a woodlot soil receiving secondary treated effluent (STE);
2. To examine temporal and spatial variation in both the water balance components and measured soil properties, particularly the sodium flux; and
3. To investigate the implications of the sodium flux on the loss of soil structure and drainage over time (dispersion events), particularly in relation to temporal changes in soil ESP and effluent SAR.

Monitoring programs for water balance components and soil parameters covered the period January 2002 – October 2003. Every two months, soil samples were taken at designated sites and at different depths (10, 20, 40, 60, and 80 cm). These samples were analysed for exchangeable cations ( $\text{Ca}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Mg}^{2+}$ ,  $\text{Na}^{+}$  and  $\text{K}^{+}$ ), from which the ESP values were derived. Also, this appears to be the first time that soil sampling at this frequency, which enables the temporal sodium flux to be determined, has been carried out.

Column leaching experiments were also performed over the study period to illustrate the response of the woodlot soil, in terms of micro-aggregate stability, to hydraulic loads of varying SAR. Column leaching experiments also confirmed the rate of solute movement through the soil profile and the woodlot soil's ability to bind/exchange sodium under different hydraulic loads and electrolyte concentrations. Soil extraction plate methods were used to determine wilting point and field capacity for these soils.

The Sodium Adsorption Ratio (SAR), which is the solutional equivalent to soil ESP, was used to define the electrolyte concentration of the applied effluent and rainfall to the woodlot. The net loss/gain of exchangeable sodium ( $\Delta\text{ESP}$ ) at different depths and times was determined and compared with changes in water balance components and the measured volumetric soil water ( $\theta$ ) over time. The soil water surplus/deficit was recorded at a daily time-step and a cumulative approach was used to determine the

long-term soil water surplus/deficit. In addition, variations in groundwater levels were monitored to observe if surplus irrigation events were reflected in temporal trends.

As a result of determining the temporal variation in soil ESP, effluent and rainfall SAR, daily soil water deficit/surplus (short-term), cumulative soil water deficit/surplus (long-term) and volumetric soil moisture, temporal trends are presented. The sodium flux was then investigated by interpreting trends in the monitored data with respect to the dominant water balance components. All parameters were then used to model the potential dispersive behaviour of the receiving soil over time and depth, in relation to the volume and electrolyte concentration of the effluent and rainfall applied over time. The implications for soil structure and permeability depend on variations in soil ESP and effluent SAR.

Results from this research show that soil ESP varied by as much as 24 % over a four-month period and is shown to be a function of the sodium loading (from STE) and soil water surplus/deficit. On each sampling occasion, soil ESP generally increased with depth at all irrigated sites. Soil ESP at non-irrigated sites was much lower than irrigated sites, although the variability in soil ESP was much greater. Variations in SAR of the waters received by the woodlot soil (effluent and rainfall) over the study period ranged from 0.5 to 5.9. It is shown that the SAR range, coupled with variations in soil ESP, has ramifications for maintaining long-term soil structure. Soil structure at different sites within a woodlot will respond differently according to the soil ESP/effluent SAR relationship.

The dispersive potential of soil at a given ESP receiving irrigation waters of known SAR was assessed in light of the relationship between soil ESP and effluent SAR. This showed the dynamic response of effluent irrigated soils to the long-term temporal variation in electrolyte concentration of rainfall/effluent. The relationship between soil ESP and effluent SAR is graphically presented as a continuum, which in turn can be used as a management tool for assessing the potential for dispersion of clay particles in a soil of known ESP and irrigated with waters of known SAR. By identifying trends in the temporal sodium flux, the *optimum* permeability of the receiving soil can be assessed in relation to the electrolyte concentration of the applied waters and the soil exchangeable sodium percentage (ESP).

Secondary treated effluent application rates can then be corrected to prevent “dispersive” irrigation events over the long term and/or management strategies applied to remove excess sodium from the soil profile. The significance of the research is that a better understanding of the temporal dynamics of sodium in the soil profile will allow improved management of effluent irrigated woodlots, with the aim of making the practice sustainable with respect to controlling accumulating soil sodium and maintaining soil structure for future landuse.