

Making Money out of Zonal Management

Adam Inchbold on behalf of PA Project Team (listed at end of paper), Riverine Plains Inc.

KEY MESSAGES FOR IRRIGATORS:

- In the Riverine Plains, zones have been successfully and easily delineated using EM38 surveys. However, elevation surveys can also be used;
- Once they are delineated, check zones with yield maps and historical knowledge;
- Monitor/test in zones. Even if no variable prescription is desired, differences in chemical fertility, soil physics and biology (including disease burden) often varies between zones, so the first implication is even when undertaking paddock average monitoring, knowledge of zones is important to ensure representative sampling;
- Use soil test decisions to write input prescriptions;
- DSN (where applicable) and crop monitor in zones;
- Test strips are a good approach to testing the profitability of variable rate;
- Different zones within paddocks have been clearly shown to have large differences in soil-water characteristics, leading to differences in yield potential;
- Yield map! Yield map! Yield map!

INTRODUCTION

Riverine Plains Inc, has previously identified variation in important soil parameters within paddocks. Other workers in Australia, have already developed a means by which this information can be brought together with yield maps and other spatial data to delineate management zones within paddocks. However, most farmers are yet to adopt this technique on a commercial scale. Consequently, a project was designed to delineate and ground truth management zones in paddocks in the Riverine Plains and then investigate options to manage these zones more appropriately, according to their own unique characteristics.

Paddocks at three sites across the Riverine Plains were selected as project paddocks. Broadly the sites are at Yarrawonga, Vic (“Grand View” - Inchbold), Burrumbuttock, NSW (“Yaralla” – I’Anson) and Urana, NSW (“Bogandillan” - Hamilton).

FORMALIZING SOIL VARIABILITY

2003 was the first year of this project. In general terms, information that already existed on the project paddocks were combined with an updated Em 38 survey to delineate potential management zones within each paddock. An extensive array of measurements were taken in each zone. In 2003, ground truthing undertaken in each zone included 0-10 cm soil tests, 0-60 cm deep soil nitrogen (DSN) tests, data from in crop monitoring, and soil moisture data using Gopher meters. This ground truthing continued in 2004 and 2005.

In 2004, an effort was made to physically survey the characteristics of the soil across several of the project paddocks at Yarrawonga. The surveyed evaluated the soil monitoring sites already existing in the projected paddocks using all of the known systems of classification including Isbell, Northcote and Great Soil Groups. This survey yielded some very interesting results.

Essentially the properties of the topsoil remained similar across much of the area surveyed, however the properties of the sub-soil changed significantly as the soil surveyor moved down the slope from

the tops of the hills through the mid slope to the points of lowest elevation. The sub-soil characteristics of greatest interest for analysis are considered to be:

1. The presence of sodicity in the profile where soil aggregates disperse;
2. Soil permeability.

On the tops of the hills, the topsoil basically overlaid a mix of B/C horizon (partially broken down parent material) with no A2 horizon present. Moving down the slope, an A2 horizon became present (chromosol), and then more pronounced. As this was happening the sub-soil became more clayey, and eventually became sodic (sodosol).

The extent of this variation is highly significant when thinking of the actual characteristics that vary in the soil through these different soil classifications. Many of these properties potentially have a marked influence on production, giving rise to the potential to target different levels of production on these different soil types. An understanding of how these vary across the paddock will provide a key to identifying when and where the crop runs out of available soil water in drier seasons, and where areas of superior drainage benefit in wetter seasons.

TEST STRIPS – A COMMON THEME

Nitrogen

In 2003, the amount of available N from DSN tests taken from 90 sample sites ranged from 31 to 320 kg N/ha. Statistics (analysis of variance) indicate that significant difference occurred between the zones, with no significant difference in values occurring between replications ($P < 0.05$). This indicates that DSN values were consistent within each zone, and therefore differences in DSN status between zones was meaningful.

As a result of the significant DSN results, an N fertilizer response experiment was set out, according to the guidelines developed by the ACPA (Australian Centre for PA). This involved the laying out of a replicated N rate trial in each zone to determine the response of each zone to varying rates of N (Figure 1a). Yield maps (Figure 1b) were used to evaluate crop performance across the zones and also to determine the yield results of the test strips. Analysis of the yield response in each zone to applied urea in 2003 performed by Brett Whelan, ACPA, is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 1. (a) Urea fertiliser application layout – yellow plots received 0 kg/ha, purple plots received 200 kg/ha, rest of the paddock received 100 kg/ha. (b) canola yield map for 2003.




Figure 2. Yield response to applied urea in each potential management class. The paddock average of 100 kg/ha is shown to provide a relatively even yield across the classes, which is confirmed by the yield map.

The yield map is generally uniform across the paddock and this is reflected in the response function analysis. The majority of the paddock received 100kg/ha and the variation between the zones at this rate was calculated to be just 0.1 t/ha on average. However, an economic examination of the response data shows that the output from the different zones would have been optimised by applying different average rates in each. The urea rate for maximum yield and economic optimum urea rate for each zone using a marginal rate analysis is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Urea rates to achieve maximum yield and economic optimum per management class.

	<i>Urea Rate for Maximum Returns (kg/ha)</i>	<i>Urea Rate for Maximum Yield (kg/ha)</i>
Class 1 (Red – High EM)	0	0
Class 2 (Green – Low EM)	169	237
Class 3 (Blue – Medium EM)	72	151

Using these response functions it is possible to make a simple estimate of what gains or losses in gross margin would have been made if this information had been used to formulate fertiliser decisions at the beginning of the season. Table 2 documents a comparison with the paddock average treatment of 100 kg Urea/ha.

Table 2. Analysis of gross margin losses from fertilising at 100 kg/ha paddock average

<i>Fertilizer waste</i>	<i>ha x kg = t</i>	<i>x \$400/t = \$</i>
Class 1	18 x 100 = 1.8	720
Class 3	59 x 18 = 1.06	424
<i>Yield loss</i>		<i>x \$400/t = \$</i>
Class 2	53 x 100 = 5.3	2120
Total Loss		3264 (25.10/ha)

As can be seen in the breakdown, in 77ha of the paddock there was more fertiliser used than required, and in 53ha of the paddock an extra application of 69 kg/ha would have brought in over 5 tonne more canola. The total loss in this scenario is \$3264 or \$25.10 per hectare.

If this information was used at the beginning of the season, the 2.86 tonne of extra urea applied in Class 1 and 3 would have been distributed to Class 2, which would still require an additional 0.8 tonne of urea to be purchased for Class 2. The cost of the extra fertiliser would have been \$320 for a gain of \$2120 in yield. The difference of \$1800 (\$13.85/ha) in gross margin would have been gained.

The true result for the 2003 season then (in gross margin terms) is that with this information at the beginning of the season, instead of essentially costing \$25.10/ha more for the return it achieved, the paddock could have improved its gross margin by \$13.85/ha. The total turn-around in gross margin is therefore potentially \$38.95/ha.

In 2004, similar DSN results were observed between zones. This was encouraging as a relatively even yield map had been observed in 2003, giving support to the concept that genuine differences in N status between zones existed. Varying rates of N were applied to a wheat crop in paddock 44 in the same test strips that were used in 2003, to continue to test the varying production potential of the different zones. Figure 3 shows the N response functions for the three zones produced from the yield map of the wheat crop in 2004.




Figure 3. N response functions from 2004 wheat crop grown in 2004

2004 had an extremely dry finish to the growing season. Not surprisingly, the high conductivity zone, with its still high N status exhibited a strongly negative correlation to extra N. Extra N in the low conductivity, with its low water holding capacity also reduced yield.

The N response functions for 2005 are shown in Figure 4. 2005 was a much more favourable year. It can be seen that the response functions resemble to a degree those seen in 2003. The low conductivity zone with its poorer soil, continues to respond to extra N when there are regular additions to its moisture profile, ie in a favourable season. The medium zone with its intermediate N statuses also responds to extra N, but the response curve tends to flatten out. The high conductivity zone, with its higher N status, responds the least to N.




Figure 4. N response functions for 2005 barley crop

Phosphorous

In a similar fashion to paddock 44, test strips were also laid out in zones in paddocks 46 and 49. These strips however have had varying rates on P applied to them in 2004 and 2005. Figure 5 shows P response functions for the 2005 wheat crop in paddock 46. The key aspect here is the significantly different response to extra P in the high conductivity zone compared to the other two zones.




Figure 5. P response functions for three zones in paddock 46.

Soil-water, one of the drivers?

Soil moisture tubes are located within management zones at “Yaralla”, Burrumbuttock, and “Grand View”, Yarrowonga. At each site, at least three moisture tubes are located in each management zone to provide some replication of results. In 2003, 2004 and 2005 soil moisture was measured at 10cm intervals down the soil profile with a moisture measurement sensor down to 1 metre. Readings were taken during the growing season twice weekly.

The soil-water measurements that are being taken are proving to be a highly valuable dataset. It can be seen that the soils in the different zones have vastly different soil-water profiles. This is obviously crucial for a zones ability to yield, and hence the picture that will develop from further measurements in this area will give a more insight into an individual zones’ ability to yield. In Figure 6, the High Zone (Blue line) in Paddock 12 extracted more water than the Medium and Low Zones. In Paddock 44 all three zones extracted a similar amount of water (i.e. have similar trends) however the Low Zone had less water to begin with.




Figure 6: Graphs of the change in Profile Available Water (mm) for the three management zones as the growing season progresses. Blue = High Zone, Green = Medium Zone and Red = Low Zone.

The above is also supported by the results from the test strips. In the end, the test strips in each zone give an indication of the production potential of that particular zone. For example, in a favourable year, the low conductivity zone has the potential to perform as well as the high conductivity zone. However, when moisture is more limiting, the low conductivity zone will generally yield lowest. The high conductivity zone seems to have the highest inherent potential to yield, as it can store more water.

Results from the N strips in 2005, have been added to DSN results for these strips prior to N application and graphed against yield to give a yield response to total available N for each of the three zones. The difference in response curves between zones is marked, supporting the notion that there is a significant difference in yield potential between zones (Figure 7).




Figure 7

This is an area that represents the next step in zonal management. If farmers know which zones have a higher production capability, then different yield targets can be allocated to different zones, resulting in a more sophisticated and more appropriate fertiliser strategy. However, it is important to remember that a very sophisticated variable rate fertiliser strategy requires very good knowledge of a particular paddocks variable characteristics to guard against costly errors. This of knowledge will be built up over time. At this stage, it would seem that there are a number of simpler steps that should be taken by farmers getting into zonal management that don't necessarily require such a comprehensive understanding of their paddocks eg variable rate lime and gypsum applications.

How much money is in variable rate?

Not surprisingly, the answer to this question is dependant on the characteristics of each particular paddock. However, it can be seen from these examples, that paddocks do vary significantly in important production parameters, and that treating these zones differently can result in an improved gross margin. In this project we have seen the potential to make money through variable rate applications of Lime, Gypsum and Nitrogen. Furthermore, a highly complex approach is not required to undertake variable rate applications. Firstly paddocks are split into two or three zones, and then these zones are simply tested as if they were individual paddocks, instead of testing across the whole paddock as an average. Inputs are then applied to individual zones according to their particular test results to achieve a more optimum level of input for the system as a whole. A generic protocol to get farmers started in variable rate has been established by the project team. It is as follows:

- EM survey & zone paddock/s
- Check EM & zones (yield maps, NDVI etc)
- Ground truth – soil cores & surface samples
- Develop VR lime & gypsum plots (+ standard paddock. strip)
- DSN test to zones
- Crop monitor to zones
- Yield map

EXTENDING THE MESSAGE

Aside from the extension of results from this project through general information days, Riverine Plains are extending results from this project to farmers through a series of discussion groups that will give farmers that chance to hear about results from this project, as well as discuss and learn about other PA related issues. Over forty farmers have signed up to be a part of this group from the general membership base. In 2005, Riverine Plains gave giving the members of the discussion group the opportunity to lay down there own own-farm trial plots to assist in the adoption of zonal management on the commercial scale. This will continue in 2006, with other PA issues such as guidance and controllers also being discussed and evaluated.

Riverine Plains “Zonal Management in the Riverine Plains” Project team

Name	Company	Contact
Adam Inchbold	Riv Plains/Farmer	03 5743 1749
Brett Whelan	ACPA	02 9351 2947
James Taylor	ACPA	02 9036 5278
Peter Baines	Riv Plains/Tim Paramore Agronomic Services	0428 211 486
Tim Paramore	Riv Plains/Tim Paramore Agronomic Services	0428 686 370
John Sykes	Riv Plains/John Sykes Rural Consulting	02 6023 1666
Lisa Cary Castleman	Riv Plains/NSW Agriculture	02 6920 5177
Dale Grey	Riv Plains/DPI Victoria	03 5871 0600
Roy Hamilton	Farmer	02 6035 0230