### **Efficient Management of Water** and Nutrient Resources: **Assessing the Potential for Drip Irrigation Fertigation** Fred Below, Tryston Beyrer and Ross Bender **Crop Physiology Laboratory Department of Crop Sciences, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign**

Fluid Fertilizer Forum, February 16, 2016 Scottsdale, AZ



Test Your Knowledge of High Yield Corn and Soybean

 What factor has the biggest impact on Corn and Soybean yield each year?

## Weather



#### **Above Average Precipitation during June, 2015**

Accumulated Precipitation (in) June 1, 2015 to June 30, 2015



Source: NOAA Midwestern Regional Climate Center



### **2015 Illinois Weather Challenges**





Adding 60 lbs of N at Various Growth Stages

Growth Stage at Application Time	Grain Yield		
	bushels acre <sup>-1</sup>		
No Applied N	140		
V2	203		
<b>V5</b>	207		
V12	208		
R2	175		
R5	149		

LSD 0.05 = 14 Average of two varieties and two years



### Test Your Knowledge of High Yield Corn

### What is the record corn yield and what is the corn yield gap?



### The Corn Yield Gap

- US average corn yield of about 170 bushels per acre
- All 18 National Corn Growers Contest winners in 2015 exceeded 300 bushels, 5 exceeded 400 bushels
- New World Record of 532.0271
   bushels per acre

### High Yield is a Family Affair 2015 National Corn Growers Contest Winners

Randy Dowdy Irrigated 1<sup>st</sup>, @ 486.2 Bridget Dowdy, Irrigated 2<sup>nd</sup> @ 477.1 Dustin Dowdy, Irrigated 3<sup>rd</sup> @ 444.6 Kevin Dowdy, No Till/Strip Till Irrigated 3<sup>rd</sup> @ 481.1 Michelle Dowdy, A Non- Irrigated 1<sup>st</sup> @ 348.9

David Hula, No Till/Strip Till Irrigated 1<sup>st</sup> @ 532.0 Craig Hula, No Till/Strip Till Irrigated 2<sup>nd</sup> @ 485.4

Jill Justice, A No Till/Strip Till Non-Irrig. 1<sup>st</sup> @ 368.8 Jay Justice, A No Till/Strip Till Non-Irrig. 2<sup>nd</sup> @ 360.3



### Strategy for Winning the Corn Yield Contest

- Feed (better plant nutrition) and protect a much higher density of plants of the best 'racehorse' hybrids
- •Make sure the crop is never stressed

### **How Have Corn Yields Increased?**



Physiology

Source USDA

### Fertility Needs for Corn Based on Soil Test Data

- Soil test values calibrated to yield in the 60's and 70's
- Do higher plant populations and more productive germplasm necessitate better fertilization strategies for corn?



### High Plant Density = Smaller Roots

# Normal Population High Population 32,000 plants/acre 45,000 plants/acre



Champaign, IL 2012



Corn & Soybean Fertility Recommendations

- <u>Current</u> = N (for corn) based on expected yield and P and K based on soil tests
- Future = Use application and fertilizer technologies to supply required crop nutrition

zsioloav

#### K Uptake & Partitioning for 230 Bushel Corn



#### K Uptake & Partitioning for 230 Bushel Corn



#### P Uptake & Partitioning for 230 Bushel Corn



Agron. J. 105:161-170 (2013)

Physiology

#### K Uptake & Partitioning for 60 Bushel Soybean



#### P Uptake & Partitioning for 60 Bushel Soybean



and three site-years during 2012 and 2013.

### **Research Objectives**

Can we use subsurface drip irrigation to maintain season-long nutrient availability and alleviate plant stress?

# Hypothesis for Better Nutrient Use with Subsurface Drip Irrigation

 Even when water from irrigation is not needed, we can increase corn yields by 30 bushels and soybean yields by **5** bushels by better timing nutrient availability with plant needs



### **University of Illinois SDI System**

- Five acres of corn and five acres of soybean with 48 equally sized zones
- Zones regulated for differential application of irrigation and fertigation
- Completed May, 2014

		Boro
		der e Alley
	13	
	14	Grass Alley Supply Line
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
•••••	19	
	20	
	21	E
	22	Block
	23	2: Soy
	24	/bean



### **Innovative Subsurface Drip System**

- Dripperline spaced every 30" buried ~14-16" below ground
- 24 different zones for each crop allows for precise application of nutrients according to plant needs



### **University of Illinois Capabilities**

- Electronic pressure reducer, flow meters
- NMC-Pro: Controls 64 relays (zones/injectors/ reducers)
- Three injectors ranging in capacity from 0.10 to 10 gal/hr
- Electronic solenoid and reducers for each zone



### **Nutrient Fertigation in Corn - 2014**

- Evaluated four hybrids ranging in population from 24,000 to 48,000 plants/acre
- Nutrients N, K, and S were fertigated (No P during 2014) based on known patterns of nutrient accumulation
- Control Treatment: 180 lbs N/acre at V4
- Fertigated Treatment: Applied (80 0 70 14S) between V6 and R2

vsioloav

### **Visual Fertigation Response**



Crop Physiology

#### All treatments balanced for water. Champaign, 2014.

#### **Fertigation Improved Yield Over Base Fertility**

Population	Irrigated	Irrigated Fertigated	
plants acre <sup>-1</sup>		bushels acre <sup>-1</sup> —	
24,000	174	191	+17*
30,000	182	197	+15*
36,000	181	198	+17*
42,000	175	197	+22*
48,000	176	194	+18*
Average	175	195	+17*

- \* Significantly greater than zero at  $\alpha$ =0.10.
- All treatments balanced for water and received base N rate (180 lbs)
- Fertigated treatments received (80-0-70-14S), Champaign, 2014.



### **Nutrient Fertigation in Soybean - 2014**

- 15 soybean varieties ranging in maturity group from 2.7 to 4.2
- Nutrients N, K, S were fertigated (No P in 2014) based on known patterns of nutrient accumulation
- Fertigated Treatment: Applied (50 0 76 16S) between V4 and R7



#### Varietal Difference in Response to Fertigated Nutrients

Variety	Control	Fertigated	Δ	Variety	Control	Fertigated	Δ
				bu A	C <sup>-1</sup>		
1	62.5	61.7	-0.8	10	64.4	67.8	3.4*
2	61.8	61.1	-0.7	11	58.9	62.9	4.0*
3	66.1	66.3	0.2	12	60.2	64.6	4.4*
4	66.6	67.1	0.6	13	61.2	66.3	5.2*
5	59.6	60.2	0.6	14	57.0	62.5	5.5*
6	61.4	62.1	0.7	15	62.1	68.2	6.1*
7	60.7	62.1	1.4				
8	59.3	61.3	2.0				
9	63.1	65.6	2.6				
		Average	0.7			Average	4.8*

\* Significantly different at  $P \le 0.05$ . Trial conducted at Champaign during 2014

### **Nutrient Fertigation in Corn - 2015**

- Five hybrids ranging in population from 32,000 to 50,000 plants/acre
- Nutrients N, P, K, S and Zn were fertigated based on known patterns of nutrient accumulation
- Control Treatment: 180 lbs N/acre at planting
- Fertigated Treatment: Applied (113 120 150 12S and 1Zn) between V6 and R5



#### **Nutrient Application Schedule for Fertigation**

Growth	Арр	plication Amount/Cumulative Total*			
Stage	Ν	$P_2O_5$	K <sub>2</sub> O	S	Zn
		lbs	acre <sup>-1</sup> ———		oz acre-1
V5&6	7/07	8/08	17/17	2/2	2/2
V7&8	4/11	2/10	8/25	1/3	0/2
V11&12	12/23	0/10	75/100	5/8	6/8
V13&14	6/29	30/40	0/100	0/8	0/8
VT&R1	24/53	20/60	25/125	2/10	2/10
R2&R3	20/73	20/80	15/140	1/11	2/12
R4&R5	40/113	40/120	10/150	1/12	4/16

\*In addition to 180 lbs N at planting: Champaign in 2015



### **Visual** Fertigation Response

#### Control 180 lbs N

All treatments balanced for water. Champaign, 2015.



#### Fertigated 180 lbs N + (113 - 120 - 150 - 125 - 12n)



### Fertigation Improved Yield Over Base Fertility

Population	Irrigated	Fertigated	Δ
Plants Ac <sup>-1</sup>		Yield (Bu Ac <sup>-1</sup> ) —	
32,000	190	243	+53*
38,000	191	247	+56*
44,000	197	248	+51*
50,000	196	245	+49*
Average	194	246	+52*

- \* Fertigated significantly greater irrigated at  $\alpha$ =0.10.
- All treatments balanced for water and received base N rate (180 lbs).
- Fertigated treatments received (113-120-150-12S-1Zn), Champaign, IL 2015.
- Averaged over five hybrids.



Hybrid Response to Fertigation						
Hybrid	Irrigated	Fertigated	Δ			
		– Yield (Bu Ac <sup>-1</sup> )				
214-45STXRIB	204	238	+34*			
7087VT2P	179	248	+69*			
<b>DKC61-54</b>	181	225	+44*			
<b>DKC64-87</b>	201	257	+56*			
N74R-3000GT	204	260	+56*			
Average	194	246	+52*			

- \* Fertigated significantly greater irrigated at  $\alpha$ =0.10.
- All treatments balanced for water and received base N rate (180 lbs).
- Fertigated treatments received (113-120-150-12S-1Zn), Champaign, IL 2015.
- Averaged over four plant populations.



#### **Nutrient Uptake and Fertilizer Recovery**

Nutrient<br/>elementIrrigatedFertigatedΔRecovery

	%			
Ν	137	210	+73*	65
$P_2O_5$	59	89	+30*	25
K <sub>2</sub> O	130	177	+47*	31
S	12.8	17.4	+4.6*	38

- \* Fertigated significantly greater irrigated at  $\alpha$ =0.10.
- All treatments balanced for water and received base N rate (180 lbs).
- Fertigated treatments received (113-120-150-12S-1Zn), Champaign, IL 2015.
- Average of five hybrids and four plant populations.



### Soybean Growth Response to Fertigation



#### **Not Fertigated**

#### Fertigated



**Treatments to Characterize Soybean Varieties** 

- •17 commercial soybean varieties, MG 2.5 to 3.9
- Fertigation schedule to provide 75 lbs N, 55 lbs  $P_2O_5$ , 150 lbs  $K_2O$ , 25 lbs S, and 18 oz Zn
- Foliar protection (Prixor fungicide and Fastac insecticide) at R3
- Fertigation and Foliar Protection



#### **Nutrient Application Schedule for Fertigation**

Growth _	vth Application Amount/Cumulative				
Stage	Ν	$P_2O_5$	K <sub>2</sub> O	S	Zn
		Ibs acre <sup>-1</sup>			
<b>V3</b>	25/25	5/5	35/35	3/3	3/3
<b>V7</b>	0/25	10/15	35/70	4/7	3/6
<b>R2</b>	0/25	10/25	35/105	4/11	3/9
<b>R4</b>	0/25	10/35	35/140	5/15	3/12
<b>R5</b>	25/50	10/45	10/150	5/20	3/15
<b>R6</b>	25/75	10/55	0/150	5/25	3/18



Champaign in 2015

### Soybean Yield Increase from Foliar Protection and/or Fertigation

Treatment	Average	Range	
	bushels acre <sup>-1</sup>		
Standard	70.5	57 - 80	
Foliar Protection	74.7	59 - 83	
Fertigation	78.6	68 - 85	
Fert. and Foliar	80.6	70 - 89	

For 17 commercial soybean varieties with RMs 2.5 to 3.9



#### Variety, Foliar Protection and Fertigation

Variety	Standard	Foliar	Fert.	Fert + Foliar
		bushels	acre <sup>-1</sup>	
S25-L9	59.3	59.1	70.1	72.7
S28-D3	57.8	67.8	74.8	78.4
S30-V6	67.0	70.9	68.7	69.5
S35-A5	75.6	82.4	83.1	89.0
S37-Z8	72.6	78.9	76.4	80.1



### Conclusions

- Yield increases on the order of 50 bushels for corn and 8 bushels for soybean from fertigation, even though extra water from irrigation was not needed
- Hybrid and variety differences in response to fertigation suggest opportunities for additional yield improvement for better nutrient use



### Acknowledgements Personnel

- Brad Bandy
- Tryston Beyrer
- Ross Bender
- Brad Bernhard
- Narjara Cantelmo
- Claire Geiger
- Andrew Harmon
- Cole Hendrix
- Brandon Litherland
- Adriano Mastrodomenico

- Katie Parker
- Ellie Raup
- Shelby Mann
- Alvero Santos
- Juliann Seebauer
- Jiying Sun
- Alison Vogel



Acknowledgements Financial Support

- BASF
- Fluid Fertilizer Foundation
- John Deere
- Mosaic
- Monsanto
- Netafim
- Syngenta
- WinField Solutions



# Very Special Thanks Fluid Fertilizer Foundation FFF Research Committee

### For more information:

# Crop Physiology Laboratory at the University of Illinois

http://cropphysiology.cropsci.illinois.edu

