Management of Fresh Wheat Residue for Irrigated Winter Canola Production

Bill Schillinger and Tim Paulitz
WSU and USDA-ARS
Objectives

1. Determine how four different WW residue management practices affect WC heath and yield.

2. Determine cause(s) for decline in WC vigor and yield as affected by WW residue management.

3. Test methods to retain WW residue without adversely affecting WC.

4. Disseminate results of research through field days, grower meetings, an extension bulletin, and a scientific journal article.
Theories

1. Straw produces toxic compounds.
2. Decomposing straw immobilizes nitrogen.
4. Excess straw keeps soils too wet and cool.
5. Straw shades WC seedlings and interferes with photosynthesis.
6. Straw serves as a food base for soil-borne pathogens, increasing disease, especially for Pythium and Rhizoctonia.
Irrigated Winter Canola Experiment

Treatments (established on fresh irrigated winter wheat stubble)

1. Burn stubble + disk
2. Chop stubble + moldboard plow
3. Burn stubble + direct seed
4. Direct seed into standing residue

Four replicates in RCB design. Plot length = 100 ft.
Stubble chopped + moldboard plow

Standing stubble
Stubble burned then direct seed

Stubble burned + disk
Burn & disk
Despite bird netting, horned larch birds ate almost every WC seedling before emergence.

We then broadcast more seed, spread garlic powder, added 2” irrigation water, and then spread more garlic. Horned larches again ate almost every WC seedling.

Field experiment moved to the Jeff Schibel farm in 2012.
Measurements in Winter Canola

1. Soil water dynamics and water use efficiency
2. Plant stand establishment
3. Rhizoctonia levels in the soil
4. Rhizoctonia AG-8 and AG 2-1 on roots
5. Soil temperature in early spring
6. Weed pressure
7. Seed yield
8. Oil content
Disease Assessment

Why it is difficult to establish winter canola in winter wheat stubble- is it a biological (pathogen), physical or environmental cause?

Is it due to *Rhizoctonia solani* AG 2-1?
Laboratory Pot Experiment

• Take soil to the greenhouse.
• Pasteurize half the soil to remove pathogens, leave the other half untreated.
• Three residue treatments: (i) no WW residue, (ii) fresh WW residue mixed with soil, (iii) fresh WW residue on surface only.
Hypothesis to be Tested

• If we seen increased winter canola growth in the pasteurized soil (where we removed the pathogens) this will prove that soil pathogens or other microbes are responsible for the phenomenon.
Effect of Residue Treatments on Dry Weight of Canola Seedlings
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Residue Treatments
Sampled Experimental Field on Schibel Farm in Oct. 2012

• Measured DNA of *Rhizoctonia solani* AG 2-1 from soil samples.
Effect of Residue Treatments on DNA levels of *Rhizoctonia solani* 2-1

![Bar chart showing the incidence and DNA level of *Rhizoctonia solani* 2-1 under different residue treatments: burned and disked, chopped and moldboard plow, direct seed standing stubble, and burned and direct seeded. The chart indicates a significant increase in incidence and DNA level under direct seed standing stubble.]
Conclusions

- Both field and greenhouse data implicate *Rhizoctonia solani* 2-1 being involved in reduced stand establishment in direct-seeding.
- Unknown- involvement of wheat and straw in this disease- is it serving as a food source for fungus?
- Does the straw create a good microenvironment for the disease in the canola seedlings?
- Does not appear that tillage (disking/plowing) is involved, because DNA levels in Treatment 4 (no disturbance) are very low.