Soil Management for Potatoes: What does the CSC tell us?

Blair M McKenzie

http://www.hutton.ac.uk/staff/blair-mckenzie

http://www.istro.org



The James Hutton Institute

> LEADING IDEAS FOR BETTER LIVES



Introduction

CSC includes potatoes in the rotation



Does the sustainable management improve soil conditions for potato production? What soil management differences are there?

Questions as to the impact of potatoes on soil conditions:

changes within the beds during the season,

following harvests from soil,

as a result of planting operations.

Introduction

Sampling in 2013, 2014, 2015 & 2016.

Sampling when potatoes as in diagram.

Subsoil at depth of cultivation.

When in cereal sample at 0, 15 & 30 cm – but comparisons only 0 & 30 cm.





Soil Physical Quality

The ability of a given soil to meet plant and ecosystem requirements for water, aeration, and strength over time and to resist and recover from processes that might diminish that ability.

Relevant measures could include

Water Stable Aggregation (WSA) – wet sieving

Bulk density

"S"

Others - macroporosity, LLWR, PAW, EAW,





1000

suction /cm

10000

100000

0.1000 - 0.0000 - 0.1

Soil Carbon

2014, Kennels field, winter barley



There is more carbon in the soil under the Sustainable Management.

Sampled to 60 cm depth and checked for bulk density.



Soil stability WSA pre-harvest 4-years

- Soil is least stable at the surface.
- Soil is more stable in the sustainable treatment.
- Differences are statistically significant, but between treatments are probably not agronomically important as both are very stable.





Conditions pre-harvest

Soil in surface not different, but conditions are better throughout the potato bed .





Performance of Potato beds

- Differences due to compost addition i.e. more organic matter (anything else)?
- Soil is least stable at the surface.
- Soil is more stable in sustainable.
- Soil in sustainable is "better" at depth of tuber expansion



Post-planting to pre-harvest & post-harvest

Differences between managements is of marginal significance.

Over multiple years

Similar response for e.g. bulk density





Post-planting to pre-harvest & post-harvest

At surface: loss of macroporosity and soil strength increases (decreasing LLWR).

At depth little change.





Harvest effects

Loss of macroporosity at surface associated with harvest

No real changes at 30 cm depth associated with harvest – why?

CSC has large stone (up to 40%) content below topsoil.

Cultivation depth in both managements is constrained.

Hutton potato harvester is < 6 Mg total load and 3 Mg wheel load.





i.e. what changes due to planting potatoes

Tillage with planting is just down to 30 cm

"S": not different with soil management





LLWR: depth & time of sampling significant



Interaction soil management x depth significant which is likely to be linked to soil strength (hardness)



Macroporosity greatest at the surface



Increase in macroporosity with bed formation that (largely) persisted

No soil management effects



- Soil conditions following planting have few differences with soil management.
- Interactions e.g for LLWR may be related to amelioration associated with the compost.



Terranimo UK

www.terranimo.dk – Now has UK button



Updated machinery/tyre options. Are we missing anything?

On-going AHDB supported work to get better links to UK soils data.



Terranimo 2	×															
	nttps://www.terr	animo.dk/Pag	ges/MainTe	rranimo.aspx?(Country	y=UK&Lan	guage=en-	GB								
👖 Apps 📙 cites	tuff 📙 clothes	📙 finance	📙 media	📙 metclimated	ays 📃	papers	, personal	📙 property	📙 societie	s 📙 sp	ort 📙 trav	vel 📙 workstuff	teabagsoilstest			
	Tillage Ores (only if recently ploughed) No										ormation 🕖					
													Soil water 🔞			
	Automatic by soil type Aanual texture								• A	Automatic by wetness Annual matric potential						
	Select soil type	ABERDEENSH	IRE	•					Sele	ct wetness	Moist	•				
		ABERDEENSH	IRE													
		BORDERS														
		DUMFRIES														
	No. B	FIFE		Silt	Sand	Organic	matter	Bulk density	N	lo.	Bottom		Ma	tric		
				[%]	[%]	[%]	[g/cm³]			[cm]			[h		
	1	MORAY		47.3	49.7	4.	2	1.08		1	10			1		
	2	PERTH & KIN	ROSS	47.3	49.7	4.	2	1.08		2	20			1		
	3	30	3.0	47.3	49.7	4.	2	1.08		3	30			1		
	4	40	4.4	43.1	52.5	4.)	1.19	4	4	40			1		
	5	50	3.1	20.5	76.4	0.	5	1.52		5	50			1		
	6	60	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89		6	60			1		
	7	70	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89		7	70			1		
	8	80	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89	1	8	80			1		
	9	90	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89		9	90			1		
	10	100	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89	1	.0	100			1		
	11	110	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89	1	.1	110			9		
	12	120	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	L	1.89	1	.2	120			8		
	13	130	3.2	19.2	//.6	0.	1	1.89	1	.3	130					
	14	140	3.2	19.2	77.6	0.	1	1.89		.4	140			(
	12	120	3.2	19.2	//.0	0.	1	1.89		.5	120					
	Reset soil and water to default															

S

0

e

<u>_</u>

B

₩

Po

Web site provided by <u>Aarhus University, Faculty of Science and Technology, Department of Agroecology</u>. Report technical problems to webmaster: <u>Poul Lassen</u>. Optimized for screen size 1280x800. Version 2.0. Build: 6628. Release date: 23 February 2018.

Conclusions

With caution: properly managed potato crops grown in good conditions are not making soil conditions significantly worse.

Some differences (improvements) in soil conditions that are associated with compost addition.

Soil in the CSC while shallow is generally stable and "well structured" and the stone content at depth may be limiting compaction problems.

Terranimo (UK) identifies soils, machinery and conditions that may place soils at risk of severe compaction to depth.



Acknowledgements

Funding from Scottish Government through RESAS & AHDB Potatoes



Scientific / Technical collaborators & support : Katharine Preedy (BioSS), Paul Hallett (U Aberdeen), Mark Stalham (NIAB-CUF), Ken Loades, Cathy Hawes, Jennifer Brown & Anna Taylor

James Hutton Farm staff



