# Fertilizer Management for Plant Health and Environmental Water Quality Protection



# Florida and California are different ...

... but we share some problems, and solutions



Nitrogen and phosphorus management for horticultural crop production can be tricky :

- Effects on crop yield
- Effects on product quality
- Effects on environmental water quality

# N rate affects crop yield



Bottoms et al., HortScience 47:1768-1774, 2012



## **Does N rate affect postharvest quality ?**

Seasonal N rates differing by > 100 lb/acre had no consistent effect on postharvest lettuce quality



Breschini and Hartz, HortScience 37:1061-1064, 2002

## N and P rates impact environmental water quality

In surface water (N and P) :
cause species shifts, algae, hypoxia
In groundwater (NO<sub>3</sub>-N) :
exceed drinking water standard
affect surface water (through springs)



# What are the environmental nutrient concentration targets ?

 Federal drinking water standard is 10 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N

 Environmental standards vary by area, can be as low at 1 - 2 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N, and 0.06 PPM PO<sub>4</sub>-P





## Where are we now ?

In coastal California :

- groundwater often 10 30 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N
- surface water is often
  - 20 40 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N
  - 0.1 0.4 PPM PO<sub>4</sub>-P

 Nutrient impairments are widespread in Florida



### So what are regulators going to do?

#### In coastal California, new rules have been proposed :

- 'N balance ratio' of 1.0 (vegetables) or 1.2 (strawberry) ratio = fertilizer N applied vs. crop N uptake
- Intent is to move toward a ratio based on N removal from the field in harvested product



### Nutrient loading to the environment

**Basic principle :** 

Fertilizer N and P applied but not removed from the field in harvested products are at risk of *eventually* being lost to the environment





### Nutrient loading to the environment

**Basic principle :** 

- Fertilizer N and P applied but not removed from the field in harvested products are at risk of *eventually* being lost to the environment
- Therefore, water quality protection requires :
  - preventing excessive P buildup in soil
  - maintaining reasonable proportionality between N application and harvest removal

Fertilization practices have long-term consequences :

San Joaquin Valley - one crop per year, vegetables and row crops Salinas Valley - two crops per year, all vegetables



#### Soil P status directly affects the degree of environmental hazard :

In a simulated runoff study using 25 California vegetable soils :



## Is P fertilization always necessary ?

P fertilizer trials in coastal lettuce :

15 lettuce fields chosen, representing the typical range of soil test P values for the Salinas Valley

P treatment comparison:

- grower's preplant P (averaged 80 lb P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/acre)
- no applied P

# Is P fertilization always necessary ?

	Soil bicarbonate	Did P fertilization
Field	P test (PPM)	improve yield?
1	35	yes
2	40	yes
3	53	no
4	54	yes
5	55	no
6	57	no
7	57	no
8	62	no
9	62	no
0	72	no
11	78	no
12	81	no
13	82	no
14	98	no
15	124	no



## How efficiently was the applied P taken up ?

Average of non-responsive fields:

	Ib P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> / acre				
P treatment	P applied	Total crop P uptake	Removal with harvest		
Grower P	80	31	20		
No P	0	30	20		

P fertilization by 'recipe' wastes money, increases pollution potential :



2004-05 lettuce field survey

# Nitrogen management : N balance gives clue to pollution potential

And Ant

IN AC

	lb N / acre				
	fertilization rate	crop uptake			
lettuce	180	140			
strawberry	190	190			
tomato	200	240			

# Nitrogen management : N balance gives clue to pollution potential

A A

	lb N / acre			
	fertilization rate	crop uptake	removal with harvest	
lettuce	180	140	70	
strawberry	190	190	90	
tomato	200	240	140	

#### Fate of applied N not removed in harvested products :



#### Remain in organic form



#### Lost through denitrification





#### Remain as residual soil nitrate

Lost as nitrate in water

# **Steps to efficient N management :**

- Be realistic in estimating crop N fertilizer requirements
- Understand crop N uptake pattern, and supply N 'just in time'
- Control irrigation efficiently
- Use monitoring tools appropriately
- remediate agricultural runoff or drainage

#### Be realistic in estimating crop N requirements :

Seasonal N fertilization of 40 commercial strawberry fields



Field

	Ave	Min	Max
Preplant	106	24	234
Fertigated	93	3	304
Total	200	118	424

## In the real world, N application rate seldom drives yield :



## Florida tomato :

2007:

- Higher yield
- Less N required

2008:

- Lower yield
- More N required



## Florida tomato :

2007:

- Higher yield
- Less N required



#### Conclusion:

It takes at least 250 lb N/acre to ensure peak productivity

2008:

- Lower yield
- More N required



## Florida tomato :

2007:

- Higher yield
- Less N required



#### **Alternative conclusion:**

 Field-specific factors govern N requirement, and N efficiency requires adjusting for those factors

2008:

- Lower yield
- More N required



#### 'Insurance' fertilization is highly inefficient :

#### **2009 lettuce trials :**

- Identified 18 fields with high residual soil nitrate
- Skipped the first N sidedressing in a plot in the middle of the field
- Compared commercial yield and crop N uptake with grower's N regime

Sidedress skip plot

## Averaged across fields :

#### lb /acre Total N **Total crop** Commercial applied N uptake harvest weight **Grower N** 134 37,300 139 **Reduced N** 61 37,400 132

#### Only 10% of the extra N applied was taken up by the crop

#### Understand crop N uptake pattern, and supply N 'just in time' :



Most vegetable crops have a similar N uptake pattern :

- Slow early N uptake
- Peak uptake of 3 6 lb N/acre/day

#### Nutrient uptake by strawberry :





N uptake averaged about 1 lb / acre / day from March through August

# IFAS recommendations for drip fertigation reflect crop N uptake pattern :

#### **Tomato**

		Total	<b>Dronlant</b> V	Weeks after transplanting <sup>w</sup>				
Production system	Nutrient	(lbs/A)	(lbs/A)	1-2	3-4	5-11	11	13
Drip irrigation, raised beds, and polyethylene	Ν	200	0-70	1.5	2.0	2.5	2.0	1.5

#### **Strawberry**

Injected<sup>x</sup> (Ibs/A/day)

InjoatadX (lbc/A/day)

				Growth period <sup>w</sup>			
Production system	Nutrient	Total (Ibs/A)	Preplant <sup>y</sup> (Ibs/A)	First 2 weeks	Sept. to Jan.	Feb. and Mar.	April
Drip irrigation,	Ν	150	0-40	0.3	0.6	0.75	0.6

#### **Control irrigation efficiently because ...**



#### N leaching losses can be substantial

# **Measuring N leaching**



#### **Suction lysimeter**



# Controlled vacuum held throughout an irrigation cycle



# What is the typical NO<sub>3</sub>-N concentration of water leaving fertilized root zones ?





10 - 30 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N common = 2 - 7 lb N/acre  $\cdot$  inch

40 - 120 PPM NO<sub>3</sub>-N common = 9 - 27 lb N / acre  $\cdot$  inch

## **Irrigation efficiency varies :**



#### Seasonal drip irrigation applied in 25 strawberry fields



## Use monitoring tools appropriately









 In-season soil NO<sub>3</sub>-N testing is the most effective tool to prevent unnecessary fertilization in California vegetable production



Which is more useful, monitoring petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N or leaf total N ?

- Leaf total N shows overall crop N status
- Petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N thought to reflect recent N uptake, or soil N availability





## Petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N has serious flaws :

not closely related to soil N availability



#### 2004-05 survey of coastal lettuce fields, early heading stage

Petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N has serious flaws :

strongly influenced by environmental factors

Six sprinkler-irrigated broccoli and cauliflower fields, sampled every 2 days over an irrigation cycle :



#### **California processing tomato N fertigation trials**









### Bottom line on petiole testing :

- as an agronomic practice, maintaining high petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N can ensure crop nitrogen sufficiency
- as a BMP practice, maintaining high petiole NO<sub>3</sub>-N will often lead to unnecessary N fertilization, which increases N pollution potential

Can water be treated to remove NO<sub>3</sub>-N ?

- Biological denitrification is promising
  - wetlands
  - denitrification bioreactors





Wood chip bioreactors :

 3 pilot-scale wood chip reactors are running in the Salinas Valley, treating tile drain effluent and surface runoff



 In coastal California conditions, annual denitrification potential is ≈ 3 lb N/yd<sup>3</sup> of bioreactor volume; in warmer Florida conditions the potential may be even greater

#### Can water quality and horticultural production coexist?



It will not be easy, but progress toward improved water quality can be made while maintaining crop productivity