# Achieving efficient N fertilizer management in Sacramento Valley wheat





S UC CE



Mark Lundy, Steve Orloff, Steve Wright & Bob Hutmacher

melundy@ucdavis.edu

**University** of **California** Agriculture and Natural Resources

### Outline

- Overview of spring wheat production in California with emphasis on Sacramento Valley conditions
- How can we construct a N budget for wheat?
- How does management influence crop N requirements?
- How can site-specific, real-time measurements assist in determining crop N needs?

#### Background: Spring wheat production in California



Image courtesy: California Wheat Commission

- Acreage : ≈ 400,000 - 700,000 ac yr<sup>-1</sup> mostly hard red/white;
- 40-60% grown for grain
- Yields ≈ 5000-6000 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- Grain growers receive payment for quantity ± quality
- Protein (quality) varies by region ≈ 11-14%

#### Nitrogen-related management in CA spring wheat

•



Image courtesy: California Wheat Commission

- Irrigation varies by region:
  - More opportunistic in the Sacramento Valley
  - More standard in the southern part of the state and Intermountain area
- Many growers in the Sacramento Valley split N applications between sowing and tillering-stem elongation
  - Total rates: 100 225 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>

## Why should we care about site-specific N management in wheat?



# Why should we care about site-specific N management in wheat?

#### N costs as a proportion of material costs in wheat



### N applied at the <u>Right Rate</u> & <u>Right Time</u>:

- Improves fertilizer use efficiency
- Increases the value of the crop



# Why should we care about site-specific N management in wheat?

#### N management plan implementation

1. Crop Year (Harvested):		4. APN(s):	5. Field(s) ID	Acres
2. Member D#				
3. Name:				
		N APPLICATIONS/CREDITS	15. Recommended/ Planned N	16. Actua N
6. Crop		17, Nitrogen Fertilizers		
7. Production Unit		18. Dry/Liquid N (lbs/ac)		
8. Projected Yield (Units/Acre)		19. Foliar N (Ibs/ac)		
9. N Recommended (tos/ac)		20, Organic Material N		
10. Acres		21 Available N in Manure/Compost		
Post Production Actuals		(lbs/ac estimate)		
11. Actual Yield (Units/Acre)		22. Total Available N Applied (los per acre)		
12. Total N Applied (bs/ac)		23, Nitrogen Credits (est)		
13. ** N Removed (lbs N/ac)		24. Available N carryover in soil;		
14. Notes:		(annualized bs/acre)		
		25. N in Irrigation water		
		(annualized, lbs/ac)		
		26. Total N Credits (lbs per acre)		
		27. Total N Applied & Available		

NITROGEN MANAGEMENT PLAN WORKSHEET

NMP Management Unit:

Wheat response to N fertilizer addition at various growth stages is generally well-understood

### Fertilizer N effects on yield and protein at various growth stages kernel weight **YIELD:** number of tillers and kernels per head **PROTEIN:** biomass N for remobilization during grain fill remobilization rate, direct

#### **Growth Stage**

**Early Leaf** 

Tillering

Stem Elongation (jointing to boot)

#### **Heading to Maturation**

Image courtesy: U. Kentucky

#### Constructing a N budget for wheat

•



- Crop N demand varies according to the protein yield potential of the crop [WHAT IS A REASONABLE YIELD EXPECTATION?]. Water is more limiting than N [IRRIGATION?].
- Crop N demand varies across the growing season [TIMING MATTERS].
- [SOIL] supplies a large portion of N to the crop.

#### Constructing a N budget for wheat: methods



### <u>Right Rate</u>? Irrigated wheat Sacramento Valley

lacksquare



7500 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>; 12% protein

Apparent N demand:  $900 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} - 300 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} = 600 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}$   $600 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} / 5.7 = 105 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}$  $105 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} / 0.5 \ (apparent N recover in grain <math>\approx 63\%$  overall NUE) = 210 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}

2.6 lb N / 100 lb grain

Apparent N demand:  $900 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}} - 300 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}} = 600 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}}$   $600 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}} / 5.7 = 105 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}}$   $105 \, _{1b \, ac^{-1}} / 0.4 \, (apparent N recovery)$ in grain  $\approx$  50% overall NUE) = 263  $_{1b \, ac^{-1}}$ 

3.7 lb N / 100 lb grain

### <u>Right Rate</u>? Supplementally irrigated wheat Sacramento Valley

- 5500 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>; 11% protein
- protein yield = 605 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- 2500 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>; 8% protein
  protein yield = 200 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- Apparent N demand:  $605 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} - 200 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} = 405 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}$   $405 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} / 5.7 = 71 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}$  $71 \ Ib \ ac^{-1} / 0.5 = 142 \ Ib \ ac^{-1}$

2.6 lb N / 100 lb grain

• Apparent N demand:  $605 |_{b ac^{-1}} - 200 |_{b ac^{-1}} = 405 |_{b ac^{-1}}$   $405 |_{b ac^{-1}} / 5.7 = 71 |_{b ac^{-1}}$  $71 |_{b ac^{-1}} / 0.4 = 178 |_{b ac^{-1}}$ 

3.2 lb N / 100 lb grain

### <u>Right Rate</u>? Rainfed wheat Sacramento Valley

- 4000 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>; 12.5% protein
  protein yield = 500 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- 2500 lb acre<sup>-1</sup>; 8% protein
  protein yield = 200 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- Range of N demand: <u>106 – 263 lb ac<sup>-1</sup></u>
- Depends on:

Water availability Fertilizer Use Efficiency • Apparent N demand:  $500 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}} - 200 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}} = 300 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}}$   $300 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}} / 5.7 = 53 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}}$  $53 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}} / 0.5 = 106 \, {}_{1b \, ac^{-1}}$ 

2.6 lb N / 100 lb grain

• Apparent N demand:  $500 \, lb \, ac^{-1} - 200 \, lb \, ac^{-1} = 300 \, lb \, ac^{-1}$   $300 \, lb \, ac^{-1} / 5.7 = 53 \, lb \, ac^{-1}$  $53 \, lb \, ac^{-1} / 0.4 = 133 \, lb \, ac^{-1}$ 

3.4 lb N / 100 lb grain

#### <u>Right Time</u>?



#### A. Preplant N only

#### B. Tillering-Flowering N

- 16% higher yield
- > 1% higher protein

#### Right Time?



#### Right Time?





















#### <u>Right Time</u>?



#### Timing of N application affects YIELD

igodol



Applications of N at
Tillering and Boot
boost yields
compared to Preplant
applications

 Assuming sufficient water follows N application

#### Timing of N application affects PROTEIN

igodol



- Applications of N at
  Boot and Flowering
  boost grain protein
  content relative to
  other application
  timings
  - Assuming sufficient water follows N application
  - Assuming crop has sufficient yield potential

#### Timing of N application affects FERTILIZER USE EFFICIENCY



In-season applications of N boost grain fertilizer recovery compared to pre-plant applications

- Interacts strongly with water availability & timing
- Large range of possibilities (0.3 – 0.70)

#### How much N will the SOIL supply?

Multiple ways to estimate, many things to estimate...

- One method (top 1 foot)
  - ppm NO3-N x 4
    - Example: 12ppm NO3-N x 4 ≈ 48 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>
- Prior Crop:
  - Tomato residue estimated at 50 lb ac<sup>-1</sup> returned, but probably reflected in soil nitrate test
  - Alfalfa contribution  $\approx 100 \text{ lb ac}^{-1} +$
- In-season soil organic matter N mineralization:
  - 0.8% OM % x 30 lb N / % OM  $\approx$  24 lb ac<sup>-1</sup>

#### A brief note on other small grains:

- Barley and Oats require substantially less N
  - Optimal yields can be achieved between 50 and 120 lb N / acre
- Durum wheat may require 130% N to achieve quality targets
  - good timing can help

## What tools are available to assist in real-time N management in wheat?



AtLEAF Chlorophyll Meter  $\approx$  \$250



Soil Nitrate Quicktest < \$50



Greenseeker handheld NDVI ≈ \$500



LAQUA NO₃ ISE ≈ \$500

#### Site-specific calibration?





Objective: Decision support thresholds that inform whether and how much N to apply at any given point in the crop cycle.



#### **Results: Calibration**







#### **Results: Calibration**







#### **Results: Calibration**







#### **Results: Decision support**





#### Summary

- 1. N demand varies across the season & from field-tofield, depends on water availability, timing.
- 2. The timing of N application can influence yield, protein and fertilizer use efficiency.
- 3. The use of site-specific, real-time measurements can provided actionable information about whether and how much N fertilizer to apply.
- 4. Combining information from more than one test may improve the ability to predict outcomes in-season.

#### Acknowledgments







Jason Tsichlis, Ryan Byrnes, Phil Mayo, Gerry Hernandez, Lalo Banuelos, Israel Herrera, Emma Torbert, Rika Fields, Katy Mulligan, Eric Lin, Dan Putnam, Chris de Ben, Israel Herrera, Fred Stewart, Jim Jackson, IREC, WSREC, and UCD Plant Sciences Field Crews.



University of California Agriculture and Natural Resources