

## SWINE MANURE APPLICATION MANAGEMENT IN A SUGAR BEET ROTATION

John A. Lamb<sup>1</sup>, Mark W. Bredeheft<sup>2</sup>, Jim Rademacher<sup>2</sup>, Nicole VanOs<sup>2</sup>, Chris Dunsmore<sup>2</sup>, and Mark Bloomquist<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Soil, Water, and Climate, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota and <sup>2</sup>Agricultural Research Department, Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative, Renville, Minnesota

### Justification of Research

Livestock operations, mainly poultry and swine, are increasing in size and impact in the Southern Minnesota sugar beet growing area. Many sugar beet producers own or have interest in these operations; thus have manure available to use on their fields. Manure research data concludes that manure has a positive effect on crop production from its effects on soil nutrient availability and soil physical properties. A concern has been raised about the effect of late season nitrogen mineralized from the manure on sugar beet quality. Grower observations indicate better growth in fields that have had manure applied. With the large amount of manure available, the question has changed from whether to use manure but when in the sugar beet crop rotation should manure be applied to minimize quality concerns and realize benefits? Nitrogen from swine manure can be 80 % available in the year after application. The implication of the manure-N release is critical, especially to sugar beet growers. Therefore, recommendations need to be evaluated with sugar beets. This research project has been designed to: 1) determine when in a three-year rotation, should swine manure be applied 2) determine nitrogen fertilizer equivalent of swine manure applied one, two, and three years in advance of sugar beet production, and determine the affect of over fertilization with N on the quality, root yield, and summer petiole nitrate-N.

### Summary of Literature Review

Little recent information is available on the effect of manure on sugar beet root yield and quality. Halvorson and Hartman (1974) reported that sucrose concentration and recoverable sugar per acre were reduced with the addition of beef manure while root yield was increased. Schmitt et al. (1996) reported that swine manure mineralization occurs several years after application in a legume-corn rotation. Swine manure was found to be 80 to 90 % available in the first year of application for corn production.

In a study conducted from 1999 to 2001, Lamb et. al 1999, 2000, and 2001 reported the effect of swine manure applied the prior fall on sugar beet production. The quality was reduced. Root yield was increased to the point that the increase compensated for the loss in quality. Results from applications made further ahead of sugar beet production were not reported because stand problems.

### Objectives

1. Determine when in a three year rotation, should swine manure be applied.
2. Determine nitrogen fertilizer equivalent of swine manure applied one, two and three years in advance of sugar beet production.
3. Determine the affect of over fertilization with N on the quality, and root yield.

### Materials and Methods

An experiment was conducted at three locations in the Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative growing area over a period of seven years to meet the stated objectives. The locations were near Prinsburg, Raymond, and Montivideo, Minnesota. The experiment included four replications of the treatments listed in Table 1. Swine manure treatments were applied at a rate of 3500 gallons per acre 1, 2, and 3 years ahead in the three year rotation of soybean/corn/sugar beet. This rotation is the most common rotation in this growing area. Treatment 1 is the check treatment for the whole experiment while treatments 9, 17, and 25 are checks for the use of only manure. Treatments 2 through 7 are for N response to fertilizer in sugar beet following a soybean and corn crop fertilized according to University of Minnesota suggestions. Treatments 10 through 16 are for N response of sugar beet after manure application is made before the soybean crop, treatments 17 through 24 are for N response of sugar beet after manure application made before the corn crop, and treatments 25 through 32 are for N response of sugar beet after manure application made before sugar beet production. The N credit treatment was determined based on previous research for corn.

Table 1. Treatment List

Treatment number	Year 1 (soybean)	Year 2 (corn)	Year 3 (sugar beet)
1	No manure	0 N	0 N
2	No manure	120 N	0 N
3	No manure	120 N	30 N
4	No manure	120 N	60 N
5	No manure	120 N	120 N
6	No manure	120 N	150 N
7	No manure	120 N	180 N
8	No manure	0 N	90 N
9	Manure	0 N	0 N
10	Manure	N credit	0 N
11	Manure	N credit	30 N
12	Manure	N credit	60 N
13	Manure	N credit	90 N
14	Manure	N credit	120 N
15	Manure	N credit	150 N
16	Manure	N credit	180 N
17	0 N	Manure	0 N
18	0 N	Manure	30 N
19	0 N	Manure	60 N
20	0 N	Manure	90 N
21	0 N	Manure	120 N
22	0 N	Manure	150 N
23	0 N	Manure	180 N
24	0 N	Manure	N credit
25	0 N	0 N	Manure
26	0 N	120 N	Manure
27	0 N	30 N	Manure
28	0 N	60 N	Manure
29	0 N	90 N	Manure
30	0 N	150 N	Manure
31	0 N	180 N	Manure
32	0 N	210 N	Manure

The Raymond location was established in the fall of 2009. Soybean was grown in 2010, corn in 2011, and sugar beet in 2012. The Prinsburg location was established in the fall of 2010. Soybean, corn, and sugar beet were grown in 2011, 2012, and 2013, respectively. After the lose of a location established in the fall 2011, the final location was near Montivideo and established in the fall of 2012. Soybean, corn, and sugar beet were grown in 2013, 2014, and 2015.

Before the soybean production year, the manure treatments (YR 1) were applied. In the soybean production year, grain yield was determined with a small combine. The year 2 (Yr 2) manure and fertilizer treatments were applied in the late fall after soybean harvest. Corn grain was harvested either by hand or with a plot combine. The year 3 (Yr 3) manure treatments were applied late fall of year 2. Fertilizer treatments were applied in the spring before planting. Root yield and quality was determined in the fall. In each of the production years, optimum production practices for pest control and nutrient management besides nitrogen were used.

### Results and Discussion

*Soybean:* Soybean was grown as the first crop in the rotation. The only treatment that was applied before soybean production was manure. The application of manure did not affect soybean grain yield at 2 of the 3 sites, Table 2. At the Montivideo site, the use of manure increase grain yields 6 bushels per acre. This is very similar to what has been reported in other studies conducted in Minnesota. Predicting when the response will occur is difficult. Application of manure before soybean production is not recommended if

the producer has corn acres to apply manure to first. The application has not cause a negative yield response in other research trials.

Table 2. The effect of manure application on soybean grain yield at Prinsburg, Raymond, and Montivideo.

	Prinsburg	Raymond	Montivideo
Treatment	Soybean grain yield (bu/A)		
Manure	42	53	38
No manure	41	52	44
Statistic (P>F)	0.62	0.23	0.0007

*Corn:* Corn was grown in the second year of the rotation. Table 3 reports the effect of N fertilizer application on corn grain yields. The grain yield response was not statistically strong at any of the sites.

Table 3. The effect of nitrogen fertilizer application on corn grain yield.

N rate lb N/A	Prinsburg	Raymond	Montivideo
	Corn grain yield (bu/A)		
0	215	191	182
30	227	184	184
60	237	192	190
90	237	193	214
120	232	189	209
150	235	200	194
180	235	178	210
210	246	198	202
Statistic (P>F)	0.13	0.16	0.09

Some comparisons between the different manure treatments and the 120 lb N/acre as fertilizer were made, Table 4. At Prinsburg, the application of manure before soybean had the poorest grain yields, while the application of manure just before the corn crop had the greatest grain yields. Application of manure before soybean production with the addition of fertilizer based on the nutrient credit from the manure before corn and the corn treated with 120 lb N/A as fertilizer had similar grain yields. These grain yields were between the corn grain yields for manure applied before soybean and the grain yields for corn with manure applied the fall before corn production. At Raymond and Montivideo, the manure applied before soybean production had smaller corn grain yield compared to the other N treatments. It appears that counting on the manure application before soybean production to supply enough N for corn production later in the rotation was not sufficient. Accounting for the N in the manure applied before the soybean production is important and if it is not enough for the needs of the corn plant then additional N fertilizer will be required.

Table 4. The effect of manure application and nutrient application on corn grain yield.

Comparison	Prinsburg	Raymond	Montivideo
	Corn grain yield (bu/A)		
*Yr 2	246	199	204
**120 lb N/A	232	196	210
***Yr 1 + NC	230	214	207
****Yr 1	206	180	176
Statistics			
Yr 2 vs 120 lb N/A	0.01	0.30	0.74
Yr 1 + NC vs Yr 2	0.004	0.85	0.60
Yr 1 vs Yr 1 + NC	0.04	0.002	0.003

\*Yr 2 = manure applied the fall before corn production.

\*\*120 lb N/A = 120 lb N/A applied and incorporated the fall before corn production.

\*\*\*Yr 1 + NC = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation plus N fertilizer applied before corn production based on the nutrient credit for the yr1 manure application.

\*\*\*\*Yr 1 = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation.

**Sugar beet:** *The effect of time of manure application before sugar beet production:* One of the questions that can be answered by this study is what is the effect of time of manure application before sugar beet production. At Prinsburg, the time of manure application significantly affected root yield, sucrose concentration, extractable sucrose per ton, and extractable sucrose per acre, Table 5. For root yield, the closer to sugar beet production was, the greater the root yield. Extractable sucrose per acre was increased with the application of manure in the rotation but time of application was not important. The quality parameters were decreased by manure being applied the fall before sugar beet production. Applying manure at other times earlier in the rotation did not affect sucrose concentration or extractable sucrose per ton.

Table 5. The means and statistical analysis for the effect of manure application on sugar beet yield and quality at the Prinsburg site.

Manure treatment	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
	ton/A	%	lb/ton	lb/A
*None	29.9	17.0	297	8893
**Yr 1	34.0	17.3	301	10242
***Yr 2	36.0	17.4	301	10850
****Yr 3	36.8	16.4	282	10366
Statistic (P>f)	0.04	0.001	0.0002	0.05

\* None = No manure or fertilizer applied in rotation.

\*\*Yr 1 = Manure applied fall before soybean production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = Manure applied fall before corn production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*\*Yr 3 = Manure applied fall before sugar beet production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

At the Raymond site, the results were similar to the Prinsburg site, Table 6. The closer in the rotation that you applied manure, the greater the root yield and extractable sucrose per acre were. The quality parameters, sucrose concentration and extractable sucrose per ton were reduced by the application of manure in the fall before sugar beet production.

Table 6. The means and statistical analysis for the effect of manure application on sugar beet yield and quality at the Raymond site.

Manure treatment	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
	ton/A	%	lb/ton	lb/A
*None	22.0	16.9	281	5637
**Yr 1	27.5	16.4	270	7390
***Yr 2	28.1	16.7	274	7727
****Yr 3	32.6	15.7	249	8182
Statistic (P>f)	0.06	0.08	0.04	0.09

\* None = No manure or fertilizer applied in rotation.

\*\*Yr 1 = Manure applied fall before soybean production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = Manure applied fall before corn production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*\*Yr 3 = Manure applied fall before sugar beet production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

The results for the Montivideo site are presented in Table 7. Unlike the Prinsburg and Raymond sites, manure application did not affect any of the parameters measured.

Table 7. The means and statistical analysis for the effect of manure application on sugar beet yield and quality at the Montivideo site.

Manure treatment	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
	ton/A	%	lb/ton	lb/A
*None	25.1	16.3	277	7048
**Yr 1	30.5	16.4	277	8601
***Yr 2	30.8	16.3	279	8592
****Yr 3	27.7	16.6	285	8002
Statistic (P>f)	0.23	0.29	0.20	0.56

\* None = No manure or fertilizer applied in rotation.

\*\*Yr 1 = Manure applied fall before soybean production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = Manure applied fall before corn production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

\*\*\*\*Yr 3 = Manure applied fall before sugar beet production in a soybean, corn, and sugar beet rotation. No fertilizer application.

At two of the three locations in this study, the closer the application of manure was before sugar beet production, the greater the root yield and extractable sucrose per acre. At those same two sites, the application of manure in the fall before sugar beet production resulted in reduced quality. One last observation for this data is that with out any N input for three year before sugar beet was grown, root yields were above 20 tons per acre at all locations. This means the N contribution from the organic matter in the soils is large.

*The effect of N fertilization and manure application:* Sugar beet was grown in the final year of the rotation. In this study, one objective was to determine if manure application timing affected N response on sugar beet yield and quality. To meet this objective, we are looking for a manure application by N rate interaction. If there is none then the result would be that manure application has no effect on the response from N fertilizer application before sugar beet production. The statistical analysis for the Prinsburg site is presented in Table 8. At Prinsburg, we did not have an interaction between manure and N fertilizer application for sugar beet root yield, sucrose, extractable sucrose per ton, and extractable sucrose per acre. Manure application and N fertilizer did not affect sucrose concentration or extractable sucrose per ton, Table 8 and 9. Manure application and N fertilizer application did significantly affect root yield and quality. Root yield increased with increasing N fertilizer application rate up to the 150 lb N/A, Table 9. This was also true for extractable sucrose per acre. The closer that you apply manure to the production of sugar beet the greater the root yield and extractable sucrose per acre.

Table 8. The statistical analysis of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Prinsburg site.

Source of variation	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
			lb/ton	lb/A
			Probability of a greater F	
Manure	0.03	0.66	0.57	0.04
N rate	0.0001	0.98	0.95	0.0001
N rate X manure	0.22	0.55	0.92	0.18

Table 9. The effect of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Prinsburg site.

N rate	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
lb N/A	ton/A	%	lb/ton	lb/A
0	32.9	17.1	296	9749
30	33.8	17.2	299	10136
60	35.3	17.1	297	10459
90	36.7	17.2	298	10907
120	37.1	17.0	295	10899
150	38.6	17.1	297	11478
180	38.1	17.1	297	11318
*None	34.4	17.0	294	10088
**Yr 1 + NC	35.1	17.2	299	10489
***Yr 2	38.4	17.2	297	11424

\*None = No manure applied in rotation, 120 lb N/A applied and incorporated the fall before corn production.

\*\*Yr 1 + NC = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation plus N fertilizer applied before corn production based on the nutrient credit for the Yr 1 manure application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = manure applied the fall before corn production.

At the Raymond site, there was no interaction between manure and fertilizer N application for sugar beet root yield and quality, Table 10. Manure application did not affect any parameter measured while N fertilizer application affected root yield, extractable sucrose per ton, and extractable sucrose per acre, Table 10 and 11. Root yield was increased with fertilizer applications up to 120 lb N/acre. Extractable sucrose per ton was reduced as the N fertilizer rate increased. Extractable sucrose per acre increased with increasing N fertilizer application up to the 60 lb N/A application. The lack of response to manure was surprising. The yield and quality responses to N application were similar to what has occurred in the past.

Table 10. The statistical analysis of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Raymond site.

Source of variation	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
			lb/ton	lb/A
			Probability of a greater F	
Manure	0.88	0.68	0.72	0.66
N rate	0.01	0.14	0.02	0.04
N rate X manure	0.19	0.44	0.60	0.55

Table 11. The effect of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Raymond site.

N rate lb N/A	Root yield ton/A	Sucrose %	Extractable sucrose	
			lb/ton	lb/A
0	28.7	16.5	272	7792
30	27.8	16.5	270	7537
60	31.3	16.6	272	8539
90	29.8	16.4	264	7836
120	31.8	16.1	259	8203
150	31.2	16.2	259	8104
180	28.7	16.3	263	7546
*None	30.1	16.4	267	8050
**Yr 1 + NC	30.1	16.3	265	7960
***Yr 2	29.6	16.4	265	7833

\*None = No manure applied in rotation, 120 lb N/A applied and incorporated the fall before corn production.

\*\*Yr1 + NC = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation plus N fertilizer applied before corn production based on the nutrient credit for the Yr 1 manure application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = manure applied the fall before corn production.

The Montivideo site did have a significant interaction between manure application and fertilizer N application for root yield and extractable sucrose per acre, Table 12. The interesting aspect of this interaction is the lack of root yield and extractable sucrose per acre response to manure and N fertilizer application individually. There was no interaction between manure and fertilizer N application for sucrose concentration and extractable sucrose per ton, but the application of N fertilizer alone, did have a significant effect, Table 12.

To understand the interaction, the means of the effect of N fertilizer at with each manure application management treatment needs to be examined, Table 13. The interaction occurred because of the differing root yield and extractable sucrose per acre responses as the 30 lb N/acre treatment. The trend of the response of root yield and extractable sucrose per acre were not the same at that N rate. When examining the data, there is no good explanation for this situation and it is concluded that random variability caused the differences. Because of this, neither manure or N fertilizer affected root yield and extractable sucrose per acre at this site.

Manure did not significantly affect sucrose concentration or extractable sucrose per ton, Table 12 and 14. As fertilizer N application rate increased, the sucrose concentration and extractable sucrose decreased, Table 14. This result occurs frequently in sugar beet.

Table 12. The statistical analysis of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Montivideo site.

Source of variation	Root yield	Sucrose	Extractable sucrose	
			lb/ton	lb/A
			Probability of a greater F	
Manure	0.23	0.54	0.75	0.55
N rate	0.14	0.0008	0.0003	0.17
N rate X manure	0.02	0.91	0.92	0.03

Table 13. The means for the interaction between N fertilizer application and manure application for root yield and extractable sucrose per acre at the Montivideo site.

N rate lb/A	Manure			Manure		
	*None	**Yr1 + NC	***Yr 2	*None	**Yr1 + NC	***Yr 2
	Root yield ton/A			Extractable sucrose lb/A		
0	22.8	30.9	30.8	6556	8549	8592
30	25.6	23.5	36.1	7235	6634	10032
60	32.2	33.8	33.3	8887	9439	9075
90		28.9	31.7		8293	8982
120	31.5	31.9	26.7	9160	9054	7253
150	33.4	27.7	30.8	9414	7246	7915
180	28.1	29.5	29.0	7636	7756	7613

\*None = No manure applied in rotation, 120 lb N/A applied and incorporated the fall before corn production.

\*\*Yr1 + NC = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation plus N fertilizer applied before corn production based on the nutrient credit for the Yr 1 manure application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = manure applied the fall before corn production.

Table 14. The effect of manure and N fertilizer application on sugar beet root yield and quality at the Montivideo site.

N rate lb N/A	Root yield ton/A	Sucrose %	Extractable sucrose	
			lb/ton	lb/A
0	28.2	16.4	279	7899
30	28.4	16.4	280	7967
60	33.2	16.2	275	9155
90	30.3	16.5	280	8637
120	29.7	16.5	280	8355
150	30.3	15.8	266	8025
180	29.0	15.9	265	7669
*None	28.3	16.4	280	7969
**Yr 1 + NC	29.6	16.3	275	8162
***Yr 2	31.0	16.1	271	8379

\*None = No manure applied in rotation, 120 lb N/A applied and incorporated the fall before corn production.

\*\*Yr1 + NC = Manure applied the fall before previous soybean crop in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation plus N fertilizer applied before corn production based on the nutrient credit for the Yr 1 manure application.

\*\*\*Yr 2 = manure applied the fall before corn production.

## Summary

The effect of timing of manure application in the soybean, corn, sugar beet rotation.

1. Manure significantly affected 2 of the 3 sites.
2. At the 2 sites, manure application increased root yield and extractable sucrose per acre. The closer to sugar beet production the application is the greater the root yield and extractable sucrose response.
3. The application of swine manure in the fall before sugar beet production, sugar beet sucrose concentration and extractable sucrose per ton is significantly decreased. Depending on the quality payment, this reduction can be economically significant.

The effect of time of manure application in the rotation and the application N fertilizer before sugar beet production.

1. No interaction occurred between N fertilizer application and manure management at 2 of the 3 sites.
2. N fertilizer rate increased root yield and extractable sucrose per acre at 2 of the 3 sites.
3. Manure management affected root yield and extractable sucrose at 1 site. The closer you apply manure to sugar beet production, the greater the yield. There was no effect at 2 sites.
4. N fertilizer application decreased extractable sucrose per ton at 2 of the 3 sites. This could affect the payment.

## **Literature Cited**

Halvorson, A.D., and G.P. Hartman. 1974. Longtime influence of organic and inorganic nitrogen sources and rates on sugarbeet yield and quality. In 1974 Sugarbeet Research and Extension Reports p. 77-79.

Lamb, J.A., M.A. Schmitt, M.W. Bredehoeft, and S.R. Roehl. 2002. Management of turkey and swine manure derived nitrogen in a sugar beet cropping system. In 2001 Sugarbeet Res. and Ext. Rpts. 32:125-134.

Lamb, J.A., M.A. Schmitt, M.W. Bredehoeft, S.R. Roehl, and J.A. Fischer. 2001. Management of turkey and swine manure derived nitrogen in a sugar beet cropping system. In 2000 Sugarbeet Res. and Ext. Rpts. 31:103-108.

Lamb, J.A., M.A. Schmitt, M.W. Bredehoeft, S.R. Roehl, and J.A. Fischer. 2000. Management of turkey and swine manure derived nitrogen in a sugar beet cropping system. In 1999 Sugarbeet Res. and Ext. Rpts. 30:132-135.

Schmitt, M.A., C.C. Sheaffer, and G.W. Randall. 1996. Preplant manure on alfalfa: Residual effects on corn yield and soil nitrate. *J. Prod. Agric.* 9:395-398.

## **Acknowledgements**

The authors would like to thank the Sugar Beet Research and Education Board for the continued funding of this project. We would also like to thank Southern Minnesota Beet Sugar Cooperative for their support.