Managing cover crops in vegetable systems

Ajay Nair, Jennifer Tillman, Dana Jokela, John-Krzton-Presson, and Kristine Neu Department of Horticulture Iowa State University

Background Tillage



Benefits

- Incorporate cover crops
- Warm soil
- Optimal seedbed

Drawbacks

- Disrupt soil biology (Karlen et al., 2013; Pelosi et al., 2014; Roper et al., 2010)
- Reduce soil structure
- Erosion

Background

Plastic Mulches

Benefits (Lamont, 2005)

- Warms soil
- Retains soil moisture
- Controls weeds in row

Drawbacks

- Time (laying, disposal)
- Material waste (Hemphill, 1993)
- Requires tillage

- More economical than other materials (Cirujeda et al., 2012)

Background

Conservation Tillage

- At least 30% of soil covered by crop residue -

Herbicide, mow, roll...No-till, strip-till...



bighambrothers.com

Drawbacks

- Compaction issues during transition years (Vian et al, 2009)
- Residues lower soil temp (Teasdale and Mohler, 1993)

ars.usda.gov

Previous research

Authors	Years	Vegetable crop	Cover crop(s)	Reduced tillage performance
Creamer et al., 1996	1991-2	Tomato	Hairy vetch/rye/ crimson clover/barley	Good
Delate et al., 2008	2002-3	Pepper	Rye/vetch	Good
Díaz-Pérez et al., 2008	2005	Pepper	Rye, rye/crimson clover, barley/crimson clover	Poor
Delate et al., 2011	2006-7	Tomato	Rye/vetch, wheat/winter pea	Good
Leavitt et al., 2011	2008-9	Tomato, zucchini, pepper	Rye, vetch, rye/vetch	Poor

Background

Rolled Cover Crops

Same yield as conventional tillage:

- Carrots (Brainard and Noyes, 2012) ST
- Pumpkins (Wyenandt et al., 2011) ST
- Peppers (Delate, 2008) ST
- Zucchini (Canali et al., 2013) NT





But sometimes lower yield:

- Tomato, zucchini, pepper (Leavitt et al., 2011) NT
- What about when compared to black. plastic mulch?

Conservation tillage: Cover crops are key!

Seeding at the right time, depth, and rate is critical for such a system to work

- Seeding rate:
 - Rye: 100 lbs/acre
 - Hairy vetch: 25 lbs/acre
- Date: Rye/vetch
 - Late Aug. late Sept.
 - The earlier the better
- Seed before a rain event, or irrigate.







Thick mat of cereal rye in the spring



Conventional tillage





Soil temperature (15 cm. depth)

	Minimum		Mean			Maximum			
Treatment ^y	Early	Mid	Late	Early	Mid	Late	Early	Mid	Late
2014									
СТ	20.3 a ^x	22.0 a	16.9	22.7 a	25.2 a	18.8 a	25.2 a	27.0 a	20.8 a
NT	18.9 b	20.5 b	16.7	20.7 c	23.1 c	18.1 b	22.6 c	23.6 c	19.7 b
ST	18.9 b	20.7 b	16.4	21.4 b	23.7 b	18.6 ab	24.2 b	25.6 b	21.5 a
Significance	***	***	NS			*	***	***	*
2015									
СТ	22.1 a	22.9 a	19.3	24.7 a	24.4 a	21.4 a	27.7 a	27.8 a	23.9 a
NT	20.6 b	21.7 b	19.3	22.3 c	22.0 c	20.5 b	24.1 b	24.7 b	22.0 b
ST	20.8 b	22.0 b	19.3	22.8 b	22.9 b	20.9 ab	25.1 b	25.6 b	22.7 b
Significance	***	***	NS			*	***	***	*

²Early: 14 June – 21 July 2014; 14 June – 17 July 2015. Mid: 22 July – 28 Aug. 2014; 18 July – 19 Aug. 2015. Late: 29 Aug. – 2 Oct. 2014; 20 Aug. – 22 Sept. 2015.

^yCT= conventional tillage; ST=strip tillage; NT=no tillage.

^xMeans within the same column and year followed by the same letter are not significantly different; Fisher's protected LSD ($P \le 0.05$). *P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001; NS nonsignificant.

Weed data

	201	4	2015		
Treatment ^y	Dry weight	Density	Dry weight	Density	
Tillage (T)					
СТ	2.0 a ^x	232 a	32.0 a	113 a	
ST	0.5 b	92 b	5.0 b	54 b	
NT	0.2 b	42 b	4.8 b	48 b	
Significance	*	**	***	**	
Region (R)					
IR	1.1 a	162 a	16.7 a	72 a	
BR	0.7 b	82 b	11.2 a	71 a	
Significance	*	*	NS	NS	
$T \times R$	NS	NS	NS	*	

^zWeeds were sampled on 2 July 2014 and 8 July 2015.

^yCT= conventional tillage; ST=strip tillage; NT=no tillage; IR=in-row; BR=between- row.

^xMeans within a column and treatment followed by the same letter are not significantly different; Fisher's protected LSD ($P \le 0.05$).

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001; NS nonsignificant.

Marketable yield



		2014	2015		
	Mar	Marketable		ketable	
Treatment ^z	Yield	No. of fruits	Yield	No. of fruits	
	(Mg·ha⁻¹)	(1000s/ha)	(Mg·ha ⁻¹)	(1000s/ha)	
Tillage (T)					
СТ	17.9	107	37.7 a	202 a	
NT	16.0	96	21.8 b	143 b	
ST	16.6	102	23.4 h	139 h	
Significance	NS	NS	**	**	
Fertility (F)					
Preplant	18.9 a	114 a	26.1	153 b	
Split	14.7 b	90 b	29.2	169 a	
Significance	**	**	NS	*	
$T \times F$	NS	NS	NS	NS	

 ^{z}CT = Conventional tillage; ST=strip tillage; NT=no tillage; Preplant = only preplant fertilizer; Split = 2/3 of N from preplant fertilizer and 1/3 from fertigation.

^yMeans in a column within the same column and treatment followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Fisher's protected LSD ($P \le 0.05$).

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001; NS nonsignificant.

Marketable yield



	2014			2015			
Treatment ^z	Marketable yield (t·ha ⁻¹)	Head diam (cm)	1	Marketable yield (t·ha ⁻¹)	Head diam (cm)		
Tillage (T)							
СТ	5.9 a ^y	8.6		20.6	11.3		
ST	3.2 b	7.7		19.0	10.7		
NT	41b	8 5		20.4	11.1		
Significance	***	NS		NS	NS		
Fertility (F)							
Preplant	6.4	9.1		22.6	11.7		
Split	5.8	8.6		2.2.5	11.5		
Significance	NS	NS		NS	NS		
$T \times F$	NS	NS		NS	NS		

 z CT= Conventional tillage; ST=strip tillage; NT=no tillage; Preplant = only preplant fertilizer; Split = 2/3 of N from preplant fertilizer and 1/3 from fertigation; No fert = unfertilized control.

^yMeans in a column within the same column and treatment followed by the same letter are not significantly different according to Fisher's protected LSD ($P \le 0.05$).

*P < 0.05; **P < 0.01; ***P < 0.001; NS nonsignificant.

Conclusions

- Lower soil temperatures in conservation tillage systems
 Broccoli and pepper yield similar between conservation vs conventional tillage
 Significant weed suppression by
 - cover crops but late-season weed management could be a challenge





Cover crop biomass (5/18/16)

Field	Average biomass (lb/A)
Billy Sammons	6,342
George Naylor	7,489

Rye at anthesis

Acknowledgements

Nair lab

- Kristine Neu, John
 Krzton-Presson, Ray
 Kruse, Dana Jokela,
 Brandon Carpenter,
- Amanda Groleau, Emily Darrah, Kyle Tester, Angelica Flores, Dan Schaben









