AMMONIA VOLATILIZATION FROM CONSTRUCTED WETLANDS THAT TREAT SWINE WASTEWATER


ABSTRACT. Increasingly, large–scale animal production occurs in confinement where large per–unit–area quantities of waste are generated. With the increased scale of production, new environment–friendly technologies are needed to deal with the waste. Constructed wetlands are considered an alternative treatment, but it is not known if volatilization of free ammonia (NH₃) governs nitrogen removal in these systems. The objective of this research was to quantify the NH₃ volatilization from constructed wetlands that treat swine wastewater. In May and July of 2000, a specially designed enclosure was used to measure NH₃ volatilization from constructed wetlands receiving swine wastewater. Laboratory and field calibration tests indicated that the enclosure was effective at measuring NH₃ volatilization. Wetland tests indicated that NH₃ volatilization was occurring. From average hourly rates, it was estimated that 7% to 16% of the nitrogen load to the wetlands was removed through NH₃ volatilization. Although NH₃ losses should not be ignored, results indicated that NH₃ volatilization was not responsible for removing the majority of nitrogen from the swine wastewater.
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The treatment of waste generated by concentrated animal operations is of increasing public concern throughout the U.S. In North Carolina, this concern is exacerbated by the fact that improper storage and handling of waste has impacted water quality (Mallin, 2000). Presently, waste generated by concentrated swine operations is stored in and partially treated by anaerobic lagoons. Lagoons are kept from overflowing by spraying the excess liquid waste on cover crops. These wastes are high in the nutrients nitrogen and phosphorus; and their overapplication can pollute surface and groundwater due to runoff and leaching from the spray fields (Stone et al., 1998). Pollution can also result from lagoon failures (Huffman and Westerman, 1995). Volatilization of free ammonia (NH₃) from anaerobic lagoons and spray fields may also contribute to excess nutrients in the watershed through dry and wet deposition (Asman, 1994). To reduce the nutrient load to the environment from animal waste, alternative forms of wastewater treatment are being examined. One promising treatment option is the use of constructed wetlands.

Constructed wetlands are an operationally passive form of wastewater treatment (Hunt and Poach, 2002; Kadlec and Knight, 1996). Initial studies have shown that constructed wetlands can effectively treat animal wastewater (Payne and Knight, 1997). This is especially true for nitrogen removal. Constructed wetlands remove nitrogen from wastewater by sedimentation, plant uptake, adsorption, nitrification–denitrification, microbial assimilation, and NH₃ volatilization (Brix, 1993; Johnston, 1991). Wetlands constructed to treat swine wastewater removed from 70% to 95% of total nitrogen when loaded at rates between 3 and 36 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ (Hunt et al., 1999).

At high loading rates, nitrification–denitrification is considered the major mechanism behind the nitrogen loss, but recent concerns have been expressed that NH₃ volatilization may govern nitrogen loss from wetlands that treat wastewater with ammonia concentrations greater than 20 mg L⁻¹ (Payne and Knight, 1997). (Note: In this article, unless otherwise indicated, the term “ammonia” denotes aqueous ammonia and ammonium in the aggregate.) Generally, in wetlands that treat animal wastewater, BOD is greater than 100 mg L⁻¹, denitrification is nitrate limited, and oxygen content of the sediment is less than 2 mg L⁻¹ (Kadlec and Knight, 1996; Knight et al., 2000). In these situations, it appears that the oxygen transfer to the wastewater may not be high enough to nitrify the ammonia assumed lost through nitrification–denitrification. If nitrification–denitrification is low in these wetlands, then NH₃ volatilization could explain the loss of nitrogen. However, NH₃ volatilization is thought to be a minor loss mechanism in constructed wetlands with non–alkaline waters and soils (Brix, 1993). This assumption is based on the fact that <1% of ammonia is present as NH₃ at pH values <8 (Kadlec and Knight, 1996). But >1% is available for volatilization because, in an open system, ammonium (NH₄⁺) will

Article was submitted for review in March 2001; approved for publication by the Soil & Water Division of ASAE in January 2002.

Mention of trade name, proprietary product, or vendor is for information only and does not constitute a guarantee or warranty of the product by U.S. Department of Agriculture and does not imply its approval to the exclusion of other products or vendors that may also be suitable.

The authors are Matthew E. Poach, Soil Scientist, Patrick G. Hunt, ASAE Member, Soil Scientist/Research Leader, E. John Sadler, ASAE Member, Soil Scientist, Terry A. Matheny, Soil Scientist, Melvin H. Johnson, Agricultural Engineer, and Kenneth C. Stone, ASAE Member Engineer, Agricultural Engineer, USDA–ARS, Coastal Plains Soil, Water, and Plant Research Center, Florence, South Carolina; and Frank J. Humenik, ASAE Fellow Engineer, Professor; and J. Mark Rice, ASAE Member Engineer, Water Quality Technician, Biological and Agricultural Engineering Department, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. Corresponding author: Matthew E. Poach, USDA–ARS, Coastal Plains Soil, Water and Plant Research Center, 2611 West Lucas Street, Florence, SC 29501–1241, phone: 843–669–5203, ext. 113; fax: 843–669–6970; e-mail: poach@florenc.es.usda.gov.
continuously convert to NH₃ to replace the NH₃ lost to volatilization. If NH₃ volatilization is a significant mechanism for nitrogen removal from constructed wetlands that treat animal wastewater, then pre–wetland nitrification of the wastewater may be necessary to prevent this volatilization and its resulting pollution. However, pre–wetland nitrification adds to construction and maintenance costs of the wetland treatment system. Therefore, it is important to measure the amount of NH₃ volatilized from treatment wetlands to determine if pre–wetland nitrification is necessary.

In the field, NH₃ volatilization is commonly measured using three methods: isotopic methods, micrometeorological methods, and enclosure methods (Harper, 1988). The isotopic method determines the total nitrogen loss from a system, but additional studies must be done to separate how much of that total loss results from volatilization, denitrification, and leaching. Isotopic methods are misleading if net NH₃ transport is not evaluated (Harper and Sharpe, 1998). Thus, the isotopic method is expensive and labor intensive. Micrometeorological techniques (eddy correlation, gradient diffusion, and mass balance) involve measuring the vertical flux density of gaseous ammonia above a study plot. These methods require the experimental area to be large (fetch > 100 m for eddy correlation and gradient diffusion, fetch > 25 m for mass balance), the wind profile to be at equilibrium, the exchange surface to be uniform, and either the wind field to be stationary or the site to have a uniform fetch (Denmead, 1983). Generally, these conditions do not exist at constructed wetland sites. The enclosure method is a viable alternative for such experimental areas.

Enclosures generally belong to two groups, steady state and non–steady state (Livingston and Hutchinson, 1995). Non–steady–state enclosures are closed to the outside atmosphere and may or may not have air circulation inside. Non–steady–state enclosures are considered inappropriate for measuring NH₃ volatilization because test conditions can differ significantly from ambient conditions, and NH₃ volatilization is affected by temperature, humidity, pressure, wind speed, and atmospheric NH₃ concentration (Harper, 1988; Harper et al., 2000; Hutchinson and Livingston, 1993). Enclosures used to measure NH₃ volatilization are generally steady–state enclosures with one or two ends open to the outside atmosphere and forced airflow (Lockyer, 1984; Vallis et al., 1982).

This research was part of a larger project investigating the ability of constructed wetlands to treat swine wastewater. The objective of this research was to quantify, using a steady–state enclosure, the NH₃ volatilization from constructed wetlands that treat swine wastewater. This research will provide insight into nitrogen cycling in constructed wetlands that treat animal waste.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**STUDY LOCATION**

Experiments were conducted in May and July of 2000 on wetlands constructed at a swine farm in Duplin County, North Carolina (35° 2′ 30″ N, 77° 57′ 30″ W). The farm includes a 2,600–pig nursery (average weight = 13 kg). Waste generated by the pigs is flushed from the houses to a single–stage anaerobic lagoon. The average liquid volume of the lagoon was 4,100 m³ with a residence time of 120 days. During the experiments, the lagoon liquid contained an average of 370, 81, 188, and 875 mg L⁻¹ of total Kjeldahl N (>82% ammonia–N), total P, BOD, and COD, respectively.

**CONSTRUCTED WETLAND DESIGN**

The constructed wetland system consisted of two parallel wetland units (fig. 1). Each wetland unit consisted of two 3.6–m × 33.5–m cells connected in series. The cells were built by soil excavation in 1992 (Hunt et al., 1994). Once the cells were excavated, their bottoms were graded to a 0.2% slope and sealed by a compacted clay liner. The clay liner was covered with a 0.25–m layer of loamy sand soil. Scirpus sp. and Juncus effusus were planted in wetland unit 1, while Typha sp. and Sparganium americanum were planted in wetland unit 2. Since then, Scirpus and Typha have come to dominate the wetlands cells where they were planted.

During the months that the experiments were conducted, two different system designs were used to load wastewater to the wetland cells. During the May experiments, wastewater was diluted with freshwater in a mix tank before it was applied to the wetland cells by two peristaltic pumps. The flow rate of the pumps was originally set to load nitrogen at an approximate rate of 25 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹, but loading was extremely variable because of fluctuations in ammonia concentration in the mix tank. These fluctuations occurred due to a malfunction in the control of the fresh/waste mix ratio. To ensure more reliable control of the N loading rate, freshwater and wastewater were applied separately to the wetlands. This design was in place during the July experiments. The fresh water used to dilute the lagoon wastewater contributed negligible amounts of N and P (total N < 0.8 mg L⁻¹ and total P < 0.04 mg L⁻¹). The effluent from each wetland unit was recycled back to the lagoon.

Wastewater flows were recorded mechanically. Inflows to the first and second cells were measured using tipping buckets equipped with reed switches and electronic counters. Outflows from the second cells were measured by use of V–notch weirs with ultrasonic depth detectors (Control Electronics, Morgantown, Pa.) and pressure transducers (Druck, Inc., PDCR 950, New Fairfield, Conn.). During the...
July experiments, freshwater inflow was measured with inline flowmeters (Neptune T–10). At each monitoring station (fig. 1), wastewater was collected daily and composited into weekly samples using automated samplers (ISCO 3700, Lincoln, Nebr.). Composite samples were collected weekly and refrigerated for later analysis.

Wetland nutrient removal efficiency was determined on a mass basis by the following equation:

$$Eff = \left(1 - \frac{(F_i \times C_i) - (F_o \times C_o)}{F_i \times C_i}\right) \times 100$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)$$

where

Eff = percent nutrient removal

$F_i$ = inlet wastewater flow ($L \text{ day}^{-1}$)

$F_o$ = outlet wastewater flow ($L \text{ day}^{-1}$)

$C_i$ = inlet nutrient concentration (mg L$^{-1}$)

$C_o$ = outlet nutrient concentration (mg L$^{-1}$).

**ENCLOSURE CONSTRUCTION**

Most steady–state enclosures described in the literature cover a small area (1 m$^2$) and are approximately 45 cm in height. These enclosures are designed to measure NH$_3$ volatilization from small, grass–covered plots and therefore are not suitable for measuring NH$_3$ volatilization from constructed wetlands containing tall plants. For this study, a larger enclosure was constructed and used to measure NH$_3$ volatilization (fig. 2). The enclosure consisted of two major components: a tunnel–shaped working section that covered a 4–m$^2$ experimental plot, and two flow–conditioning sections that were attached to the open ends of the working section.

The working section (4 × 1 × 2.5 m, L×W×H) was constructed to span a wetland cell and to encompass the wetland plants in the plot (figs. 2 and 3). It was necessary to encompass the plants with the enclosure because NH$_3$ gas may be emitted or absorbed by wetland plants. The width of the working section was chosen to keep material and weight to a minimum without affecting enclosure stability. Because the enclosure was to be moved to different cells within each site, it was constructed to be lightweight and rigid. The frame was constructed with 1–inch aluminum pipe (sch. 40) and stabilized with 3/32–inch stainless steel cable. Polyethylene sheeting was used to cover the frame. To secure the plastic to the frame, it was sandwiched between a two–piece clamp, the base piece of which was permanently attached to the frame. A dolly–type system was used to raise and lower the enclosure and to move it between plots.

Two variable–speed fans were used to generate airflow through the enclosure (fig. 2). They were mounted at each end of the enclosure to allow for control of pressure inside the enclosure, which could affect the rate of NH$_3$ volatilization. During a test, contraction or expansion of the plastic surrounding the frame indicated overpressure or underpressure in the enclosure. Adjusting individual fan speed so the plastic sides were slack minimized pressure differences within and without the enclosure. Flow straightening was accomplished with a set of vertical and horizontal vanes built into the inlet flow conditioning section. The wind speed generated by the fans was measured with two anemometers: one located at a 2–m height at the center of the enclosure, and one located after the outlet fan (fig. 2). Airflow through the tunnel was determined by recording the time it took to fill a long plastic sock of known volume with the outflow air. Airflow was then correlated with the readings of the outflow anemometer. The readings of the outflow anemometer were used to determine airflow during field tests.

![Figure 2. Diagram of enclosure showing dimensions and component placement.](image-url)
Air temperature was measured using thermocouples placed at the inlet and outlet of the enclosure. An additional thermocouple was attached to the lower part of the enclosure’s frame to measure the water temperature in the plot. During each test, temperature and wind-speed were recorded continually with a datalogger (CR23, Campbell Scientific, Inc., Logan, Utah).

**NH₃ Measurement**

Atmospheric NH₃ was captured using a gas-washing-bottle technique (Harper et al., 2000; Vallis et al., 1982). Bench tests of a closed system indicated that the gas-washing bottles collected 100% of the NH₃ passed through them (table 1). To collect NH₃ in air entering and leaving the enclosure, a set of two bottle mounts was attached directly before the inlet and the outlet of the enclosure (fig. 2). During lab and field tests, vacuum pumps were used to continuously pull a sample of air through the bottles at a constant rate of 6 L min⁻¹. To prepare bottles for NH₃ collection, they were rinsed once with 0.2 M H₂SO₄ and then were filled with 80 mL of 0.2 M H₂SO₄. After a test, the air inlet tube of each bottle was rinsed with 10 mL of 0.2 M H₂SO₄, and then the volume of each was brought to 100 mL. Samples from each bottle were stored on ice and analyzed at the laboratory.

**Laboratory Calibration**

Four tests were conducted in the laboratory to determine the efficiency of our procedure for determining NH₃ volatilization. To prepare for each test, gas-washing bottles were placed in their mounts at the inlet and outlet of the enclosure, and pans containing a 1-L ammonium sulfate solution were placed inside the enclosure. Ammonia was volatilized from the pans by adding 100 mL of 1 N sodium hydroxide. The fans were then started and adjusted to equilibrate pressure inside the enclosure. Vacuum pumps were turned on at the same time as the fans. After two hours, 100 mL of 1 N sulfuric acid was added to the pans to neutralize the alkali and to stop NH₃ volatilization. Fans and vacuum pumps were run for an additional two minutes to ensure that all NH₃ gas was evacuated from the enclosure. The amount of NH₃–N volatilized was equal to the difference in NH₄–N content of the pans before and after each test.

Trapping efficiency was determined by the following equation:

$$\text{Eff} = \left(\frac{T_a \times F_d}{d_p}\right) \times 10$$

(2)

where

- $\text{Eff}$ = ammonia trapping efficiency of the enclosure
- $T_a$ = amount of NH₃–N captured by outlet gas-washing bottles (µg)
- $F_d$ = airflow through enclosure (in L min⁻¹) divided by the air sampling rate of 6 L min⁻¹
- $d_p$ = difference in the amount of NH₄–N in pans between the start and the end of a test (mg).

During four calibration tests, the amount of NH₃–N volatilized from the pans ranged from 101 to 129 mg, while the amount of NH₃–N captured by the bottles ranged from 27 to 30 µg (table 2). The trapping efficiency ranged from 91% to 103% with an average efficiency of 98%. Because this mean value is not significantly different from 100%, the trapping efficiency of the enclosure was assumed to be 100% for lab and field tests.

### Table 1. Efficiency of gas-washing bottles to recover gaseous ammonia evolved in a closed, bench-scale system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>NH₃–N Evolved (mg)</th>
<th>NH₃–N Trapped (µg)</th>
<th>Trap Efficiency[a] (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Efficiency = 101 ± 2

[a] Efficiency = NH₃–N trapped / NH₃–N evolved × 100.

### Table 2. Trapping efficiency of the enclosure during laboratory tests as determined from the ammonia evolved from pans in the enclosure and recovered by gas-washing bottles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NH₃–N Evolved, Actual[a] (mg)</th>
<th>NH₃–N Trapped, Actual[ac] (µg)</th>
<th>Airflow Ratio[b] / trap[c]</th>
<th>NH₃–N Evolved, Estimated[d] (mg)</th>
<th>Efficiency[e] (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>3930</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>3875</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>3923</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Efficiency = 98 ± 5

[a] NH₃–N evolved from pans placed in enclosure.
[b] Airflow through enclosure.
[c] Air sampling rate of 6 L min⁻¹.
[d] Estimate determined as follows: NH₃–N evolved = NH₃–N trapped / 1000 × Airflow ratio.
[e] Efficiency = estimated NH₃–N evolved / actual NH₃–N evolved × 100.
FIELD CALIBRATION
To determine if the inside of the enclosure acts as a sink or a source of NH$_3$, control tests were conducted at the constructed wetland site. Prior to each test, the enclosure was placed on a plastic sheet with its plastic sides rolled up to reduce climate changes in the enclosure. Gas–washing bottles were mounted at the inlet and outlet, and the sides of the enclosure were dropped and locked into place. The fans were turned on, adjusted to equilibrate pressure inside the tunnel. Vacuum pumps were then turned on to begin NH$_3$ sampling. Tests of 2–hour duration were conducted at multiple locations adjacent to the wetland cells.

During each control test, the amount of NH$_3$–N collected by the inlet gas–washing bottles was not significantly different ($p = 0.05$) from the amount collected by the outlet gas–washing bottles (table 3). These results indicated that, during a test, the enclosure would be neither a sink nor a source of NH$_3$.

WETLAND TESTS
Ammonia volatilization was measured at two locations in each of the four wetland cells in both May and July of 2000.

### Table 4. Parameters for ammonia volatilization tests conducted on constructed wetlands in Duplin County, North Carolina, during May of 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Distance from Inlet (m)</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Test Duration (hours)</th>
<th>Waste NH$_3$–N (mg L$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Plot Airspeed[a] (m s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Airflow (L min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air In</th>
<th>Air Out</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>09:40</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>29791</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>38826</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13:50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>35550</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>33653</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4282</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>04:45</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>20397</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>36012</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>29553</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>28542</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16:05</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>30413</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>08:30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>22721</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Airspeed measured by the anemometer located at the center of the enclosure, 2 meters above the plot surface.

### Table 5. Parameters for ammonia volatilization tests conducted on constructed wetlands in Duplin County, North Carolina, during July of 2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Distance from Inlet (m)</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>Test Duration (hours)</th>
<th>Waste NH$_3$–N (mg L$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Plot Airspeed[a] (m s$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>Airflow (L min$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>pH</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Air In</th>
<th>Air Out</th>
<th>Temperature (°C)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>28310</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>24540</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31745</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>26418</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16:05</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>26401</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>08:35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>25104</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>09:30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>32536</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>22725</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Airspeed measured by the anemometer located at the center of the enclosure, 2 meters above the plot surface.

In May, six tests were conducted at one location during a 21–hour period to assess diurnal effects. Tests were conducted in the same manner as the field calibration tests, except the plot was not covered with a plastic sheet. The duration of these tests ranged from one to two hours.

During each wetland test, wastewater grab samples were collected from and pH measured in an area next to the study plot. Enclosure location and settings and environmental conditions for each wetland test are summarized in tables 4 and 5.

NH$_3$ volatilization in mg N m$^{-2}$ hour$^{-1}$ was determined using the following equation:

### Table 3. Difference in ammonia (NH$_3$–N, in μg) captured at the enclosure inlet and outlet during field calibration tests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>In</th>
<th>Out</th>
<th>Out – In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>−0.5[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>−0.9[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>−0.4[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.9[a]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>−0.4[a]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Not significantly different from zero (LSD$_{0.05}$ = 3.4).
\[ V_d = \frac{d_A \times F_d}{A_p} \times \frac{1 \text{ mg}}{1000 \mu g} \]  

where

- \( V_d \) = \( \text{NH}_3 \) volatilization
- \( d_A \) = difference in \( \text{NH}_3-N \) captured by outlet and inlet gas–washing bottles (\( \mu g \))
- \( F_d \) = Airflow through enclosure (in \( \text{L min}^{-1} \)) divided by the air sampling rate of 6 \( \text{L min}^{-1} \)
- \( A_p \) = Plot area (4 \( \text{m}^2 \))
- \( D \) = duration of the test in hours.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

In May of 2000, the \( \text{NH}_3-N \) collected at the enclosure inlet ranged from 0.2 to 36.6 \( \mu g \), while in July it ranged from 10.6 to 29.9 \( \mu g \) (tables 6 and 7). Variation in the \( \text{NH}_3-N \) collected likely resulted from variations in the atmospheric background \( \text{NH}_3 \), in test duration, in airflow through the enclosure, and in the location of the enclosure inlet in relation to on–site sources of atmospheric \( \text{NH}_3 \), such as the hog barn and the waste lagoon. Background \( \text{NH}_3 \) fluctuates as a function of air temperature, humidity, and wind speed (Harper, 1988; Harper et al., 2000; Hutchinson and Livingston, 1993).

In May, the \( \text{NH}_3-N \) collected at the enclosure outlet ranged from 3.1 to 77.4 \( \mu g \), while in July it ranged from 11.3 to 53.9 \( \mu g \) (tables 6 and 7). Variations in the \( \text{NH}_3-N \) collected likely resulted from variations in \( \text{NH}_3 \) volatilized from the study plot, in \( \text{NH}_3 \) that entered the enclosure, in test duration, and in airflow through the enclosure.

For all tests, the wetlands acted as a source rather than a sink for \( \text{NH}_3 \) because outlet \( \text{NH}_3-N \) was equal to or higher than inlet \( \text{NH}_3-N \) (tables 6 and 7). The wetlands also acted as a source over a 24–hour period because tests conducted at night had outlet \( \text{NH}_3-N \) values that were significantly higher than inlet \( \text{NH}_3-N \) values. Statistical analysis indicated that a difference of greater than 10.3 \( \mu g \) was significant at a 95\% confidence level. Differences between \( \text{NH}_3-N \) collected at the inlet and outlet ranged from 0.6 to 56.4 \( \mu g \) for the entire study (tables 6 and 7). The \( \text{NH}_3-N \) volatilization rates calculated from these differences ranged from 2 to 50 \( \mu g \) \( \text{m}^{-2} \text{hour}^{-1} \) in May and from 1 to 19 \( \mu g \) \( \text{m}^{-2} \text{hour}^{-1} \) in July.

Five \( \text{NH}_3-N \) volatilization rates were not significantly different from zero (tables 6 and 7). Three of the five were measured at plots farthest from each wetland inlet (second plot in second cells). These rates are consistent with low

---

### Table 6. Ammonia volatilization from constructed wetlands in Duplin County, North Carolina, during May of 2000 as determined from the ammonia captured at the enclosure inlet and outlet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Test[a]</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>NH3–N (µg)</th>
<th>NH3–N Volatilization[b] (mg N m⁻² hour⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out</td>
<td>Out – In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11:50</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13:50</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15:55</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20:30</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4:45</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13:35</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>77.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8:30</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[b] Volatilization = \([\text{NH}_3-N \text{ out} – \text{NH}_3-N \text{ in}] \times (\text{enclosure airflow} / 6 \text{ L min}^{-1}) / 4 \text{ m}^2 / \text{duration}] \times (1 \text{ mg} / 1000 \mu g).
[c] Not significantly different from zero (LSD₀.₀₅ for Out – In = 10.3).
[d] The results of tests on plot 1 were averaged to determine a single volatilization rate before the mean volatilization rate was determined for the entire wetland.
wastewater ammonia–N concentrations at these plots
(Tables 4 and 5). The other two low rates were unexpected
because they were measured at plots closest to the wetland
inlet. It was anticipated that the wastewater ammonia
concentration would be highest at the wetland inlet and
decrease with increasing distance from the inlet. Therefore,
NH₃ volatilization was expected to be highest at plots closest
to the wetland inlet. Results were not consistent with this
expectation because factors other than wastewater ammonia
concentration affect NH₃ volatilization (Harper et al., 2002).
The low rate measured close to the inlet of the Scirpus
wetland likely resulted from high background NH₃ entering
the enclosure (Table 6). High atmospheric NH₃ can suppress
NH₃ volatilization (Harper et al., 2002; Hutchinson and
Livingston, 1993). There was no obvious reason for the low
rate measured at the plot closest to the inlet of the Typha
wetland, so it may be an outlier.

Multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine
what factors could have affected NH₃ volatilization. No
significant relationship was found between NH₃–N volati-
ilization and select environmental parameters, despite theoret-
ical expectations. The same was true when the analysis was
conducted after excluding the potential outlier mentioned
above. However, a significant relationship was uncovered
when the analysis was conducted after also excluding the
highest NH₃–N volatilization measured in May in the Scirpus
wetland. The type of wetland (Scirpus or Typha), NH₄–N
concentration and temperature of the wastewater, and airflow
through the enclosure explained 70% of the variation in
volatilization (not shown). Research on NH₃ volatilization
from swine waste lagoons found that it was correlated to wind
speed, to wastewater temperature, to wastewater ammonia
concentration, and to wastewater pH (Harper et al., 2002).

The results of the regression analysis could indicate that
NH₃–N volatilization values measured at the two excluded
sites were outliers. However, the lack of a relationship using
the full data set could have resulted from inaccurate measures
of the independent variables rather than from inaccurate
measures of NH₃–N volatilization. Therefore, all data were
used in subsequent calculations of mean NH₃–N volatiliza-
tion rates with notations on the effect of potential outliers.

The magnitude of NH₃ volatilization can be determined
by averaging rates across each wetland, by extrapolating
these hourly averages to daily averages, and by then
comparing daily rates to nitrogen loading rates. The extra-
polation of daytime hourly rates to daily rates was considered
valid because daytime and nighttime tests in May produced
similar results. However, previous studies of NH₃ volatili-
ation have found a diurnal pattern in which NH₃ volatilization
was lower during the night (Harper et al., 2002; Vallis et al.,
1982). Therefore, our daily NH₃–N volatilization rates may
overestimate the actual rates.

Wastewater application to the constructed wetlands
produced nitrogen loading rates from 17 to 55 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹
(Table 8). The high loading rates resulted from a mechanical
breakdown that prevented dilution of the wastewater by
freshwater prior to application. In May, the mean NH₃–N
volatilization rates were 5.0 and 3.9 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ for the
Scirpus and Typha wetlands, respectively (Table 8). Exclud-
ing the potential outliers, mean NH₃–N volatilization rates
were 2.6 and 5.1 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ for the Scirpus and Typha
wetlands, respectively. In July, mean NH₃–N volatilization
rates were 2.7 and 2.7 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹ for the Scirpus and
Typha wetlands, respectively (Table 8). Generally, NH₃–N
volatilization rates reported here were slightly lower than the
summer rates measured for swine waste lagoons (2.9 to
8.4 kg N ha⁻¹ day⁻¹) with similar ammonia–N concentrations
(Harper et al., 2002). This was expected because of the higher
wastewater pH and wind–exposed surface area of the waste
lagoons.

Ammonia volatilization removed 7% to 10% (5% to 10%
excluding the contentious data) of the nitrogen loaded to
the wetlands in May and removed 14% to 16% of the nitrogen
load in July. These results help to resolve the recent
dichotomy of opinions concerning the degree of NH₃
volatilization from wetlands that treat wastewater. Data from
this study indicate that the concentration of NH₃ in wastewa-
ter underestimates NH₃ volatilization. In this study, more
than 7% of ammonia volatilized, even though less than 1.1%
of ammonia was in the NH₃ form (Tables 8 and 9). An
explanation for this is that the calculated concentration of
NH₃ is an equilibrium concentration, so as NH₃ is lost to
volatilization, it is replaced by conversion of NH₄⁺. To

Table 7. Ammonia volatilization from constructed wetlands in Duplin County, North Carolina, during
July of 2000 as determined from the ammonia captured at the enclosure inlet and outlet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell</th>
<th>Plot</th>
<th>Test[a]</th>
<th>Start Time</th>
<th>NH₃–N (µg)</th>
<th>NH₃–N Volatilization[b] (mg N m⁻² hour⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In</td>
<td>Out – In</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.6[c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14:35</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>5.6[c]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16:05</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8:35</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9:30</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>1[c]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[a] Cross-reference with Table 5.
[b] Volatilization = [(NH₃–N out – NH₃–N in) × (enclosure airflow / 6 L min⁻¹) / 4 m² / duration] × (1 mg / 1000 µg).
[c] Not significantly different from zero (LSD0.05 for Out – In = 10.3).
Table 8. Average N loading, N removal, and ammonia volatilization from constructed wetlands in Duplin County, North Carolina.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Plant Type</th>
<th>N Loading (kg N ha(^{-1}) day(^{-1}))</th>
<th>N Removal (kg N ha(^{-1}) day(^{-1}))</th>
<th>NH(_3) Volatilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N Loading</td>
<td>N Removal</td>
<td>% of load([a])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\([a]\) Mass N volatilization / mass N load \times 100.
\([b]\) Mass N volatilization / mass N removed by wetland \times 100.

Table 9. Free ammonia in constructed wetlands at Duplin County, North Carolina, as determined from wastewater temperature and pH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Temp.,([a]) (°C)</th>
<th>pH([b])</th>
<th>Free Ammonia([b]) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scirpus</td>
<td>Typha</td>
<td>Scirpus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\([a]\) Means from data presented in tables 4 and 5.
\([b]\) Free ammonia = 100 × ((6344 / (273 + t)) + 10pH) \times 100 (modified eq. 1 from Vanotti and Hunt, 2000).

In May and July, wastewater processes removed from 14 to 33 kg N ha\(^{-1}\) day\(^{-1}\) from the wetlands (table 8). Therefore, NH\(_3\) volatilization accounted for 12% to 28% of the nitrogen removed by the constructed wetlands (table 8). The highest NH\(_3\)-N volatilization rate measured in May is reason volatilization accounted for 28% of nitrogen removal during that period. When that value is considered an outlier, then NH\(_3\) volatilization accounted for 14% of the nitrogen removal. Using either estimate, these results show that NH\(_3\) volatilization was not the primary nitrogen removal mechanism operating in these constructed wetlands, but its contribution to nitrogen loss should not be ignored. The balance of nitrogen loss likely resulted from denitrification because denitrification enzyme activity analysis indicated that denitrification was a significant process in the wetlands (Hunt et al., 2000). Our conclusion is reinforced by results of research on gaseous nitrogen emission from swine waste lagoons (Harper et al., 2000, 2002). These studies found that NH\(_3\) volatilization was not the dominant mechanism for nitrogen loss from waste lagoons because dinitrogen emission from the lagoons was equal to or greater than NH\(_3\) volatilization.

CONCLUSIONS

Laboratory and field calibrations confirmed that the enclosure could effectively measure NH\(_3\) volatilization. For most tests, including the evening and early morning tests, the outlet NH\(_3\)-N was significantly higher than the inlet NH\(_3\)-N. Thus, NH\(_3\) volatilization occurred, and it occurred throughout a 24-hour period. Mean NH\(_3\)-N volatilization rates ranged from 2.7 to 5.0 kg N ha\(^{-1}\) day\(^{-1}\). These rates were obtained by extrapolating hourly rates to daily rates, a calculation that might have overestimated NH\(_3\)-N volatilization. NH\(_3\) volatilization removed 7% to 16% of the total nitrogen loaded to the wetlands and accounted for 12% to 28% of the total nitrogen removed by the wetlands. However, the 28% value is possibly an overestimation because its calculation was heavily influenced by one high NH\(_3\)-N volatilization rate. These results indicate that, during the measurement periods, NH\(_3\) volatilization was not responsible for the majority of nitrogen removed from the swine wastewater, but its contribution to nitrogen loss should not be ignored.
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