USING ORGANIC AMENDMENTS

AUTHORS: Cheryl Buckwalter, Organic Farming Education Program Intern, Cindy Fake, Horticulture and Small Farms Advisor, Placer and Nevada Counties Publication Number 31-072C (published Nov. 2003)

Organic and sustainable growers use amendments such as manures, animal and plant derived meals, and mined minerals to satisfy plant nutrient needs. These amendments serve as fertilizers, but many also have beneficial effects on the soil. They may contribute organic matter and microbial biomass, as in the case of manures. They may also positively affect soil properties, for example, in sodic clay soils, gypsum causes clay particles to flocculate, improving infiltration.

Most nutrients in organic amendments are not in a soluble form, but are released slowly into the soil. This reduces the risk of leaching and nutrient loss, and thus, the potential for pollution of water resources. This is particularly important for nitrogenrich materials.

Organic amendments are generally not as easy to use as synthetic fertilizers for a number of reasons. They are less concentrated and concentration may vary greatly from product to product, and from season to season for the same product.

Manures are particularly subject to variability, depending upon the length of time between production and utilization, as well as the method of application. Nitrogen losses from volatilization and from leaching can be very high in unmanaged manure piles.

There are no uniform labeling standards for organic materials. Many organic amendments are wet materials, and the nutrient analysis given on the package or in charts is by *dry* weight. Manures and meals may be wet, and can contain up to 75% water. Organic amendments are also generally more expensive per pound of nutrient, compared to synthetic materials. However, ancillary benefits are not calculated into the cost.

While many use organic amendments, few growers actually calculate how much they need of each amendment to supply to nutrient needs of the particular crop they are producing. This publication is intended to help determine which materials might be best for your particular crop needs and how to calculate the amounts you need.

Calculating How Much to Use

Calculations for organic amendments can be difficult because materials may be wet, nutrient components may differ from season to season and from brand to brand. Once you have calculated the amount needed, those calculations may be used as guidelines for future years and you may not need to calculate each time.

You should, however, be keeping track of your plant health and nutritional status. For perennial crops, a regular program of plant tissue sampling will help you to apply the correct amendments to satisfy plant needs. For annual crops, soil testing may be more helpful, especially if you grow a diversity of crops and rotate them from field to field. Tissue testing may also be done, but your crop may be half way through its life cycle before you know that it is deficient in a particular nutrient, if it is not showing obvious deficiency symptoms.

While calculations may be somewhat tedious and confusing, many users of organic amendments overapply nutrients. This can cause a number of problems, as well as being expensive for the grower. Overapplication of high nitrogen amendments allows nitrogen to leach through the soil or move into waterways with storm runoff.



COOPERATIVE EXTENSION, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIAPlacer CountyWEB SITE: ceplacernevada.ucdavis.eduNevada County

11477 E Avenue (*Bldg 306, DeWitt Center*) Auburn, California 95603 (**530**) **889-7385** FAX (530) 889-7397 **E-Mail:** ceplacer@ucdavis.edu The University of California, in accordance with applicable Federal and State law and University policy, does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, sex, disability, age, medical condition (cancer-related), ancestry, manifal status, citizenship, sexual orientation, or status as a Vietnam-era veteran or special disabiled veteran. Inquiries regarding the University's nondiscrimination policies may be directed to the Affirmative Action Director, University of California, Agriculture and Natural Resources, 1111 Franklin, dith Floor, Oakland, California 94607-5200. (510) 987-0096.

United States Department of Agriculture, University of California, Placer and Nevada Counties cooperating.

255 So Auburn (Veterans Memorial Bldg) Grass Valley, California 95945 (530) 273-4563 FAX (530 273-4769 E-Mail: cenevada@ucdavis.edu Excess applications may also cause unwanted chemical changes in the soil. For example, a soil which was acidic when cropping began, may become alkaline because of repeated applications of lime based on the original soil analysis.

Continued application of nutrients in amounts greater than that needed by the plant, can cause toxicities, which are detrimental to crop growth. A good example is boron. The range between boron deficiency and excess is very narrow, and excess B is toxic to plants. Another nutrient that seems to often be applied in excess on organic cropping systems in the foothills is phosphorus. Many foothill soils are initially low in available phosphorus, and most amendments supply slow-release P. However, continued application without soil or plant tissue testing

can lead to excess P in the soil.

Careful calculation of nutrient needs supplied by organic amendments will save money, reduce leaching and toxicity problems, and prevent unwanted changes in soil properties.



OR	ORGANIC AMENDMENTS & APPROXIMATE ANALYSIS (dry weight basis)										
Material	Nitrogen (N)Phosphorus (P2O5)Potassium (K2O)Calcium (Ca)Other		Other	Relative Availability	Refer- ences						
Percent by Weight											
Bat guano (R) (decomposed/dry)	2-10.0%	2-8.0%	0.0-2.0%			Medium	12,13				
Blood (dried)	10-13.0%	1-2.0%	0.5-2.5%			Medium- Rapid	1, 5, 9,10, 11,12,15, 26, 36				
Bone meal (steamed)	0.5-4.0%	11-34.0%	0.0-0.2%	22.0%		Slow-Medium	5, 9, 10, 11,12,13, 26				
Calcium carbonate (dry) (oyster shell, calcitic lime [CaCO ₃])				36- 50.0%		Slow-Medium	2, 6, 41, 44				
Chicken manure (dry) ^M	1.0-4.5%	.80-6.0%	.39-2.4%			Medium- Rapid	2, 5, 8,10, 11,12, 36				
Compost	1-8.0%	0.5-1.0%	1-2.0%			Slow	12, 26				
Cow - dairy manure (dry) ^м	0.6- 2.10%	0.3-1.1%	0.6-3.6%	1.36%	.36 Mg	Medium	7, 11,12, 36				
Cow - steer manure (dry) ^м	1-2.5%	0.5-1.6%	1.9-3.6%			Medium	9, 11,12, 36				
Dolomitic limestone (CaCO ₃ · MgCO ₃ dolomite)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	24-30.0	6-14.0 Mg	Slow	26, 44				
Feather meal	7-15.0%				.8 Mg	Slow	2, 9, 12, 13, 15, 45				

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

ORGANIC AMENDMENTS

OF	RGANIC AME	ENDMENTS & A	APPROXIMA ⁻		SIS (dry wei	ght basis)				
Material	Nitrogen (N)	Phosphorus (P ₂ O ₅)	Potassium (K ₂ O)	Calcium (Ca)	Other	Relative Availability ⁹	Refer- ences			
Percent by Weight										
Fish emulsion	3-6.0%	1-2.0%	1-2.0%			Medium- Rapid	5,11, 26			
Fish meal	10-11.0%	2-6.0%	0-2.0%			Slow-Rapid	1, 6, 9,10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 36			
Goat manure (dry) ^м	0.6-2.7%	.33-1.8%	.75-2.8%			Medium	11,12			
Grape Pomace	0.9-3.0%	0.0-0.5%	0.0-2.0%			Slow	5, 12, 38			
Greensand (glauconite, mined)	0.0%	0.0-2.0%	3-9.0%			Very Slow	12,13, 26, 44			
Gypsum (mined) (calcium sul- fate,CaSO₄· 2H₂O)				18.25- 25.2%	15-23.2% S	Slow-Rapid (depends on particle size)	3, 6, 38, 40, 42, 44, 49			
Hoof & horn meal	10-14.0%	1-2.0%	0.0-1.2%		.3 Mg	Slow-Fairly Rapid	5, 12, 36, 45			
Horse manure ^м	0.7-3.0%	0.3-2.0%	0.5-3.0%			Medium-Slow	11,12, 24, 44			
Kelp (liquid)	0.2%	1.0%	1.0%			Rapid	13			
Kelp meal (dry)	0.7-1.2%	0.0-0.5%	1.0-5.0%			Slow	1, 5,12, 44			
Potassium sulfate (K₂SO₄, sulfate of potash)			50-52.0%		16-18.0% S	Medium- Rapid	1,13, 38, 44, 47			
Rabbit manure [™]	2.0- 2.20%	.87-1.3%	1-2.30%	1.26%		Medium	7,11			
Rock phosphate (soft)	0.00%	20-35%	0.00%	19.0%	2.7% Fe 21.0% Si	Slow, 1-2.0% immediately available	1, 6, 10, 13, 26, 44			
Sheep manure ^м	2-6.0%	1-3.0%	2-2.50%			Medium	11, 12, 44			
Soybean meal	6-7.0%	1-2.0%	1.5-2.0%			Slow-Medium	26, 36			

OF	ORGANIC AMENDMENTS & APPROXIMATE ANALYSIS (dry weight basis)										
Material	Nitrogen (N)	Phosphorus (P ₂ O ₅)	Potassium (K ₂ O)	Calcium (Ca) Other		Relative Availability ⁹	Refer- ences				
	Percent by Weight										
Sulfate of potash magnesium (potassium magne- sium sulfate)			21.0%		11.0% Mg 18-23.0% S	Medium- Rapid	1, 12, 13, 26, 38, 44, 47				
Wood ash (R)	0.00%	1-3.0%	3-7.0%			Rapid	1, 10, 12, 26, 36				
Zinc sulfate (R)					22-36.0% Zn 17.5% S	Rapid	13, 44				

Symbol Key:

M-Manures, refer to National Organic Program (NOP) rules regarding use of manures

R-Regulated, specified as a Regulated material on the Organic Materials Review Institute's (OMRI) Materials List⁵¹

Mg-Magnesium; S-Sulfur; Zn-Zinc.

Information provided in this document was compiled from the *Resources* and *Other References* cited and is intended for reference purposes only. No guarantee or warranty is expressed or implied for any of the materials included on this list. Evaluate products carefully.

Certified Organic Growers should refer to the OMRI List and the USDA National Organic Program

Calcu	lating Orgar	nic Amend	ment Needs	Based o	n Soil Analy	/sis
	Nitrogen (N)	Phosphorus (P ₂ O ₅)	Potassium (K₂O)	Lime	Sulfur (S)	Boron (B)
Soil Analysis Recommendation	100 lbs./acre	40 lbs./acre	120 lbs./acre	2000 lbs./ acre	30 lbs./acre	1 lb./acre
1. Phosphorus - Be needed to supply 40	• • •					
Source & Nutrient	Content:					
	Bone Meal	3% N	20% P ₂ O ₅	0.2% K ₂ O ₅		
	Recommended Rate (Ibs./acre) of Phosphorus		Percent Phosphorus in Amendment		lbs./acre of Bone Meal to Apply	
	40 lbs.	÷	.20 (20%)	=	200 lbs./acre	
2. Before figuring ou (nitrogen and phosp applied to satisfy P	horus) are being s	supplied with the	e bone meal. To d	o this, multiply	y number of poun	
	lbs. applied to satisfy P Requirement		Percent Nitrogen in Amendment		Amount of Nitrogen in Bone Meal	
	200 lb./acre	x	.03 (3%)	=	6 lbs./acre	
	lbs. applied to satisfy P Requirement		Source Nutrient Proportion (%) of Potassium		Amount of Potassium in Bone Meal	
	200 lb./acre	x	.002 (.2%)	=	.4 lbs./acre	
3. Nitrogen - To cal ber of pounds per a						
	Recommended Rate (Ibs./acre) of Nitrogen		Amount supplied from Bone Meal		Amount of Nitrogen still needed	
	100 lbs.	-	6 lbs./acre	=	94 lbs.	
Select a source for	the remaining N ne	eded to satisfy	recommendation.	This example	uses feather me	al.
Source & Content:						
	Feather Meal	15% N	0% P ₂ O ₅	0% K ₂ O		
	Remaining amount of N needed		Percent Nitrogen in Amendment		lbs./acre of Feather Meal to Apply	
	94 lbs.	÷	.15 (15%)	=	627 lbs./acre	

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COOPERATIVE EXTENSION

Source & C	ontent:							
	Potassium Sulfate (K ₂ SO ₄)	50% K ₂ O	18% S					
Recom- mended K (Ibs./ acre)		Amount from Bone Meal		Recom- mended K		Percent K in amendment		Ibs./acre of K ₂ SO ₄ to apply
120 lbs./ acre	-	0.4	=	120 lbs./ acre	÷	.50 (50%)	=	240 lbs./ acre
material.	lbs./acre K ₂ SO ₄ applied		Percent S in amendment		Amount S in Potassium Sulfate		. ,	
	applied		amenument		Sullate			
	240 lbs./ acre	x	.16 (18%)	=	38.4 lbs.			
Note that this	240 lbs./		.16 (18%)	=				
6. Boron -	240 lbs./ acre s is more sulfu To calculate h mended amou	r than recomn ow much of th	.16 (18%) nended. ne source nutrie	ent or amer) lb./acre o	f boron,
6. Boron - divide recom	240 lbs./ acre s is more sulfu To calculate h mended amou	r than recomn ow much of th	.16 (18%) nended. ne source nutrie	ent or amer	38.4 lbs.) lb./acre o	f boron,
6. Boron - divide recom	240 lbs./ acre s is more sulfu To calculate h mended amou	r than recomm ow much of th int by the sou 11.30%	.16 (18%) nended. ne source nutrie	ent or amer	38.4 lbs.) lb./acre o	f boron,

	alculate how m ended amount l									bs./aci	re of Lime,
Source & Con	tent:										
	Dolomitic Limestone		100% lime								
	Recommend Rate (Ibs./ac of Lime			Source Proporti Dolo							Amount of Dolomite to Apply
	2,000 lbs/ac	re	÷		1		=	1	(100% Lime)	2	,000 lbs./acre
cost by the nur	nber of pounds Cost per Package or Ioad	needed	Size of I in Ib. (e.	o obtain th Package g.: 50 lb. ag)		Cos	acre per st per ound	r nutrier	nt. No. of Ibs. Need to Apply / acre		Cost / Acre / Nutrient
Bone Meal	\$23.20	÷	5	0	=	\$(0.46	X	200	=	\$92.80
Feather Meal	\$13.50	÷	5	0	=	\$(0.27	x	627	=	\$169.29
Potassium Sulfate						\$(0.22	X	240	=	\$53.76
Borax	\$45.00	÷	5	0	=	\$(0.90	X	9	=	\$8.10
Dolomite	\$5.99	÷	5	0	=	\$(0.12	X	2,000	=	\$239.60
	TOTAL COST PER ACRE						=	\$563.55			

Key References

- Alternative Soil Amendments. Horticulture Technical Note. 1998, 2001. B. Hall, P. Sullivan. Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA). Fayetteville, AR. www.attra.ncat.org.
- 2) Soil Fertility Management for Organic Crops. 2000. M, Gaskell, J. Mitchell, R. Smith, S. T. Koike, C. Fouche. 2000. UC ANR Publication 7249. <u>http://anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu</u>.
- Western Fertilizer Handbook. Second Edition. 1998. Produced by the Soil Improvement Committee, California Fertilizer Association. Interstate Publishers, Inc. Danville, IL.
- 4) Building Soils for Better Crops. Second Edition. 2000. F. Magdoff, H. van Es. Sustainable Agriculture Network (SAN), Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education (SARE) Program of CSREES, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Sustainable Agriculture Publications. Burlington, VT.
- 5) Organic Soil Amendments and Fertilizers. 1992. D.E. Chaney, et al. UC ANR Publication 21505.

Other Resources

- Western Nevada County Gardening Guide. 2001. Nevada County Master Gardeners. UC ANR Publication 3382.
- Producing and Marketing Organic Produce. 1999. O. Bandele. US Department of Agriculture. <u>http://</u> <u>marketingoutreach.usda.gov/</u> info/99Manual/organic.html.
- Manures for Organic Crop Production. 2003. G. Kuepper. Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA), National Sustainable Agri-

culture Information Center. Fayette-ville, AR.

- Organic Potting Mixes for Certified Production. 2002. G. Kuepper, K. Adam. Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA), National Sustainable Agriculture Information Center. Fayetteville, AR.
- Organic Gardening: Some Pros and Cons. Horticulture Facts. J.C. Schmidt. University of Illinois. Champaign, IL.
- Pests of the Garden and Small Farm. A Grower's Guide to Using Less Pesticide. Second Edition. 1998. M.L. Flint. UC ANR Publication 3332
- 12) How to Convert an Inorganic Fertilizer Recommendation to an Organic One. 2000. W. McLaurin, W. Reeves. Cooperative Extension Service. The University of Georgia College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. Circular 853.
- 13) Peaceful Valley Farm Supply 2003 Catalog. Grass Valley, CA. www.groworganic.com.
- 14) Organic Apple Production Manual. 2000. S.L. Swezey, P. Vossen. J. Caprile, W. Bentley. UC ANR Publication 3404.
- Organic Blueberry Production. Horticulture Production Guide. 2000. G.L., Kuepper, S. Diver. Update by K. Adam. Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA), Fayetteville, AR.
- 16) Highbush Blueberry Production Guide. 1992. M.P., Pritts, J.F. Hancock, Editors; B. Strik, Contributing Editor. Northeast Regional Agricultural Engineering Service, Cooperative Extension. Ithaca, NY. NRAES-55.

- 17) *Citrus*. 1966. L. Walheim. Ironwood Press. Tucson, AZ.
- Citrus Health Management, Growing and Handling for Fresh Market. L.W. Timmer, L.W. Duncan, Editors. Plant Health Management Series.
- 19) Satsuma Mandarins for the Foothill Garden. 2001. D. Newman, C. Fake. UC ANR Publication 31-109.
- Micronutrient Deficiencies of Citrus. 1981. R.G. Platt. UC Division of Agricultural Sciences. Leaflet 2115.
- 21) *Citrus Nutrition Management.* 2001. J.H. Connell. Orland Citrus Meeting. Butte County.
- Sustainable Cut Flower Production, Horticulture Production Guide. 2000.
 L. Greer. Appropriate Technology Transfer for Rural Areas (ATTRA), National Sustainable Agriculture Information Center. Fayetteville, AR.
- 23) Peaches, Plums, and Nectarines, Growing and Handling for Fresh Market. 1989. J.H. LaRue, R.S. Johnson, Technical Editors. UC ANR Publication 3331.
- 24) Knott's Handbook for Vegetable Growers. 1998. Third Edition. O.A. Lorenz, D.N. Maynard. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley & Sons. New York, Chichester, Brisbane, Toronto, Singapore.
- Bell Pepper Production in California.
 T.K. Hartz, M. LeStrange, K.S. Mayberry, R.F. Smith. UC ANR Publication 7217.
- 26) Organic Vegetable Production. 2002. G. Brust, D.S. Egel, E.T. Maynard. Purdue University. Cooperative Extension. West Lafayette, IN. ID-316.
- 27) Integrated Pest Management for Tomatoes. 1998. L.L. Strand, Fourth Edition Revisions; P.A. Rude, First

Edition; M.L. Flint, Technical Editor. UC ANR Publication 3274.

- 28) Guide For Fertilizing Vegetables. Family Farm Series. UC Cooperative Extension, Small Farm Center. Davis, CA. ANRP 012.
- 29) Processing Tomato Production in California. T.K. Hartz, G. Miyao. UC ANR Publication 7228.
- 30) Cucumber Production in California. W.L. Schrader, J.L. Aguiar, K.S. Mayberry. UC ANR Publication 8050.
- 31) Summer Squash Production in California. R. Molinar, J. Aquiar, M. Gaskell, K. Mayberry. UC ANR Publication 7245.
- 32) Efficient Use of Organic Nitrogen Fertilizers. 2001. M. Gaskell, Principal Investigator; H. Klauer, J. Witty, D. Markolf, Collaborators. Organic Farm- 42) Agricultural Gypsum Specification ing Research Foundation. Santa Cruz, CA. Information Bulletin Number 9.
- 33) Grapevine Nutrition and Fertilization in the San Joaquin Valley. 1978. L.P. Christensen, A.N. Kasimatis, F.L. Jensen. UC Division of Agricultural Sciences, Publication 4087.
- 34) Western Fruit Gardening. 1953. R.M. Brooks, C.O. Hesse. University of California Press. Berkeley & Los Angeles, CA.
- 35) From Vines to Wines. 1999. J. Cox. Storey Books, Transcontinental Printing. Canada.
- 36) California Master Gardener Handbook. Second printing 2002. D.R. Pittenger, Editor. UC ANR Publication 3382.
- 37) Commercial Specialty Cut Flower Production, Fertilization of Field Grown Specialty Cut Flowers, 1995, A.B. Stevens. Cooperative Extension Ser-

vice, Kansas State University. Manhattan, Kansas, MF-2154.

- 38) Cultural Practices for Commercial Vinevards. 1981. T.D. Jordan, R.M. Pool, T.J. Zabadal, J.P. Tomkins. New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, A Statutory College of the State University at Cornell University. Ithaca, NY. Miscellaneous Bulletin III.
- 39) Orchard Management. 1994. W. Reil. Yolo-Solano Counties.
- 40) Converting Fertilizer Rates for Small Gardens, N.C. Welch, D.B. Walsh. UC ANR. Publication 7191.
- 41) Plant Nutrition from the Sea. Farmer to Farmer, No. 16, 1996, B. Baker, Waldoboro, Maine, http:// www.noamkelp.com.
- Sheet. 100% Good Stuff Gypsum[™]. AWCO, Carson City, NV, and Wallace Labs, El Segundo, CA. http:// www.awgypsum.com.
- 43) Purchasing Nutrients for Hay and Forage Crops. C. Little, J. McCutcheon. Ohio State University. Columbus, OH. Fact Sheet ANR-7-99.
- 44) Nutrient Content of Fertilizer Materials. 1999. C.C. Mitchell, Alabama Cooperative Extension System. Auburn University, Alabama. ANR-0174.
- 45) Environment/Recycling. Recycling of Feathers and Down. European Down & Feather Association. http:// www.edfa-mainz.de. Germany.
- 46) Interpreting Soil Test Results for Commercial Crops. The University of Maine. Orono, ME. http:// anlab.umesci.maine.edu.
- 47) N-P-K Fertilizers, Soils & Soil Management - Fertilizer, 1990, M.L. Vitosh. Michigan State University Ex-

tension, IMP Data Base List. East Lansing, MI. Extension Bulletin E-896. http://www.msue.msu.edu/msue/ imp.

- 48) Liming of Vineyard Soils. Practical Winerv & Vinevard Magazine, July/ August 1999, T.J. Rice, San Rafael, CA. http::// www.practicalvinevard.com.
- 49) Frequently Asked Questions about Soil Testing & Fertilizers. Revised 1997. Compiled by P.T. Hight, M.R. Tucker, J. K. Messick, North Carolina Department of Agriculture & Consumer Services. http:// www.agr.state.nc.us/agronomi/ stfags.htm.
- 50) Soil and Plant-Tissue Testing in California. 1978. H.M. Reisenauer, Editor. UC Division of Agricultural Sciences, University of California. Berkeley, CA. Bulletin 1879.
- 51) OMRI Generic Materials List. 2002. Organic Materials Review Institute.Eugene, OR. www.omri.org.
- 52) Consolidated National List (7CFR 205.600-607), December 2001 Final Rule with Amendments. 2003. Compiled by the Organic Materials Review Institute. Eugene, OR.