

Canola in Wheat-Based Rotations: Update from Two Long-Term Field Experiments Near Ritzville



BILL SCHILLINGER¹, JOHN JACOBSEN¹, RON JIRAVA², TIM PAULITZ³, JEREMY HANSEN³, DAN SCHLATTER³, CASSANDRA RIESER², AND DAVE HUGGINS³

¹DEPT. OF CROP AND SOIL SCIENCES, WSU; ²FARMER COLLABORATOR, RITZVILLE; ³USDA-ARS

Two long-term canola cropping systems experiments are well underway at the Ron Jirava farm near Ritzville, WA. In Study 1, canola grown in a 3-year WC-SW-NTF rotation is compared to 3-year rotations of WW-SW-UTF and WT-SW-NTF (acronyms are defined below). Note that SW follows WC, WW, and WT and that a 13-month fallow period occurs after SW in all three rotations. In Study 2, canola is grown in a 4-year rotation of WC-NTF-WW-NTF and is compared to WP-NTF-WW-NTF as well as a 2-year WW-UTF check. Spring canola is substituted for WC when adequate WC stands are not achieved. Both experiments have gone through full rotation sequences; thus, all crops are truly “in rotation”. Agronomic data collected from these experiments includes: soil water dynamics from all phases of all rotations, foliar and root diseases, weed ecology, and grain yields. Soil microbial activity is currently being assessed in both canola rotations using DNA sequencing (Schlatter and Paulitz, see next abstract) and PLFA methods (Hansen, Rieser, Huggins). In addition, mycorrhizal inocula to enhance/promote soil microbial biomass in canola and subsequent crops are being evaluated. Such data can only be obtained through long-term cropping systems experiments. Schillinger and colleagues have published several scientific journal articles on these topics in the past three years and more publications are expected as we more fully explore canola rotations for Washington’s drylands.

Acronyms used: NTF, no-till summer fallow; PLFA, phospholipid fatty acid analysis; SW, spring wheat; UTF, undercutter-tilled summer fallow; WC, winter canola; WP, winter pea; WT, winter triticale; WW, winter wheat.

Yield Decline of Wheat After Canola: In Search of a Microbial Cause



DAN SCHLATTER¹, JEREMY HANSEN¹, BILL SCHILLINGER², AND TIM PAULITZ¹

¹USDA-ARS; ²DEPT. OF CROP AND SOIL SCIENCES, WSU

In a series of replicated field trials over six years in the Reardan area, spring wheat grown after winter canola had an average 17% yield decrease compared to when grown after winter wheat (Schillinger and Paulitz, 2018, *Field Crops Research* 223: 26-32). We could not explain this with diseases, nutrients, weeds, or water use. We postulated that canola may either favor a microbial community deleterious to wheat or may decrease beneficial microbes that are important for wheat health (Hansen et al., 2018, *Applied Soil Ecology* 130:185-193). We attempted to answer this question by sampling the DNA from the rhizospheres of wheat and canola from fields in Douglas and Adams County (see 2018 Field Day Abstracts page 50) but did not come up with a “smoking gun”. Many of the fungal and bacterial communities on the roots of wheat and canola were in common, but we could detect some differences. We now have an opportunity to address this question again in a long-term cropping systems project near Ritzville (see previous abstract) where we are experiencing this same yield reduction of wheat after canola.

In the spring of 2019 (and planned again for 2020), we sampled bulk and rhizosphere soils of actively-growing spring wheat following canola, winter wheat and winter triticale. DNA will be extracted from the samples and sequenced with Illumina MiSeq. We will analyze the bacterial and fungal communities to identify differences among the three rotations. This will complement the phospholipid fatty



The term “rhizosphere soil” refers to soil that adheres to the roots of plants as seen here with winter canola. Photo by Jeremy Hansen, USDA-ARS.

acid analysis which is underway concurrently by Jeremy Hansen and colleagues. We hope to understand how canola may impact soil health, both positively and negatively. By understanding the cause of this phenomenon, we can understand the conditions under which it is a problem and possibly how it can be mitigated.

Dual Purpose Winter Canola Grazing and Seed Harvest



ISAAC MADSEN¹ AND STEVE VANVLEET²

¹DEPT. OF CROP AND SOIL SCIENCES, WSU; ²WSU EXTENSION

In order to get the most out of a canola crop many farmers and researchers have been interested utilizing early seeded winter canola as a 'dual purpose' crop. The 'dual purpose' canola would be planted in mid or early summer, grazed in the fall, and taken to harvest in the following spring. However, the effect of fall grazing on the winter survival of canola is unknown. In the fall of 2017, a winter grazing trial was established near Dusty, WA. The canola was planted with a hoe style drill into good moisture on July 19th 2017. The field was divided into 3 pastures. Cattle grazing began in paddock 1 on September 15th and were moved to a second paddock 2 on September 26th, the cattle grazed through pasture 2 much faster than pasture 1, and where moved pasture 3. The grazing in pasture 2 was heavier than pasture 3 and the stand in pasture 2 appears to have been more damaged than pasture 3 (Fig. 1). The canola was harvested the following July with a Wintersteiger plot combine. One harvest swath was cut per pasture ranging from 150-300 ft in length and 5 ft wide (Table 1). Weight gain on cattle was estimated by weighing a sub sample of steers before and after they had grazed the pastures. Weight gain on the steers was used to estimate the economic benefits of grazing. Further work should be conducted in replicated trials, lending a higher degree of certainty to the results.




Figure 1. Ungrazed canola, heavily grazed canola (Paddock #1), and lightly grazed canola (Paddock #2).

Takeaways: There appears to be economic potential for grazing winter canola in the fall following seeding. Light grazing of winter canola appears to do little damage to the following canola seed yield, but grazing appears to damage canola yield.

Table 1. Seed yield and cattle gain from canola grazing.

Treatments	Yield (lbs/a)	Elevator price/lb canola seed	Economic value of canola seed	Grazing pressure (46 head)	Economic value for grazing cattle (ADG)	Total Economic Return (\$/a)
Pasture 1	2464	\$0.129	\$317.80/a	Heavy	197.34	515.14
Pasture 2	2143	\$0.129	\$276.45/a	Severe	197.34	473.79
Pasture 3	3322	\$0.129	\$428.58/a	Light	157.87	586.45
Ungrazed	3384	\$0.129	\$436.52/a	None	0	436.52