



PATHWAYS TO WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT IN THE MYRTLE CREEK SUB-CATCHMENT

2018/2019 WET SEASON

Pathways to water quality improvement in the Myrtle Creek sub-catchment, is monitoring paddock-scale run-off water quality on four farms in the sub-catchment (Proserpine mill area). Funded by the Department of Environment and Science, each site compares a different management practice related to nutrient or herbicide management. The results support previous research and demonstration results linking practices such as:

- timing application to avoid run-off for at least the first 20 days after application
- incorporation of herbicides and nutrients with irrigation can assist in improving water quality.
- Less on, less off

The project aims to allow growers to look at water quality at the farm scale, with the opportunity to compare different practices they are interested in. Please note these are demonstration sites, not statistically analysed research trials.

A summary of the results is provided below. Please contact Molly O'Dea for further information.

Note:

LOR = limit of reporting (concentration too low to be detected by the lab equipment used)

DIN = Dissolvable inorganic nitrogen (measure of the plant available forms of nitrogen)

FRP = Filterable reactive phosphorous (measure of the plant available forms of phosphorous)



SITE 1 – UP RIVER

Drop N rates in old ratoon?

Sampler 1 – 500 kg/ha Prosi ratoon fert (116 N, 14 P)

Sampler 2 – 700 kg/ha Prosi ratoon fert (162 N, 20 P)

Total runoff DIN as % of applied N:

1 – 0.189%

2 – 0.221%

Total runoff FRP as % of applied P:

1 – 0.100%

2 – 0.114%

*2 runoff events missed due to localised flooding

LESS ON LESS OFF

SITE 2 – STRATHDICKIE

Account for N in mill mud?

Sampler 1 – mill mud 100tph + Econo LOS 3.5m³/ha (158 N, 0.3 P)

Sampler 2 – mill mud 100tph + Econo LOS 2.5m³/ha (113 N, 0.2 P)

Total runoff DIN as % of applied N:

1 – 0.111%

2 – 0.068%

FRP lost in runoff*:

1 – 1289 g/ha

2 – 2154 g/ha

*negligible P applied, can't calculate % P lost

DIURON AND ISOXAFLUTOLE (balance) applied and TESTED, all concentrations were less than the LOR (<1 ppb).

SITE 3 – THE GREGORY

Nitrification Inhibitor?

Sampler 1 – Vizura Econo LOS (nitrification inhibitor) + P applied at 3.5m³/ha (157 N, 13 P)

Sampler 2 – Vizura Econo LOS (NO nitrification inhibitor) + P applied at 3.5m³/ha (157 N, 13 P)

Total runoff DIN as % of applied N:

1 – 1.13%

2 – 1.38%

Total runoff FRP as % of applied P:

1 – 0.218%

2 – 0.343%

No herbicides 2018. Diuron 2017. Imidacloprid (Confidor) 2016.

DIURON concentrations below LOR (<1 ppb).

IMIDACLOPRID: sampler 1—all below LOR (<1 ppb), sampler 2—3 readings below LOR (<1 ppb), 1 reading = 1 ppb.

CHEMICALS STILL PRESENT YEARS AFTER APPLICATION

SITE 4 – HAMILTON PLAINS

BOBCAT i-MAXX vs FLAME & ATRADEX?

Sampler 1 – Bobcat i-MAXX @ 3.8 L/ha (imazapic 25 g/L, hexazinone 125 g/L)

Sampler 2 – Flame @ 360ml/ha and Atradox @ 2.2kg/ha (imazapic 240g/L, atrazine 900g/L)

Both samplers 160 N, 0 P

Total runoff DIN as % of applied N:

1 – 0.062%

2 – 0.048%

FRP lost in runoff*:

1 – 61 g/ha

2 – 133 g/ha

*no P applied, can't calculate % P lost

DIURON AND ISOXAFLUTOLE (balance) applied and TESTED, all concentrations were less than the LOR (<1 ppb).

ATRAZINE LOSS

1 – 0.172%

2 – 1.416%

IMAZAPIC LOSS

1 – 3.417%

2 – 2.234%

HEXAZINONE LOSS

1 – 6.028%

2 – 0.5537%

IMIDACLOPRID LOSS

1 – 1.985%

2 – 1.842%

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION PLEASE CONTACT

Molly O'Dea [E mo'dea@sugarresearch.com.au](mailto:mo'dea@sugarresearch.com.au) [M 0439 619 082](tel:0439 619 082)

Copyright © 2019 - All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of SRA. **Disclaimer** In this disclaimer a reference to 'we', 'us' or 'our' means SRA and our directors, officers, agents and employees. Although we do our best to present information that is correct and accurate, we make no warranties, guarantees or representations about the suitability, reliability, currency or accuracy of the information we present in this Information Sheet, for any purposes. Subject to any terms implied by law and which cannot be excluded, we accept no responsibility for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred by you as a result of the use of, or reliance on, any materials and information appearing in this Information Sheet. You, the user, accept sole responsibility and risk associated with the use and results of the information appearing in this Information Sheet, and you agree that we will not be liable for any loss or damage whatsoever (including through negligence) arising out of, or in connection with the use of this Information Sheet. We recommend that you contact our staff before acting on any information provided in this Information Sheet. **Warning** Our tests, inspections and recommendations should not be relied on without further, independent inquiries. They may not be accurate, complete or applicable for your particular needs for many reasons, including (for example) SRA being unaware of other matters relevant to individual crops, the analysis of unrepresentative samples or the influence of environmental, managerial or other factors on production.

This project is funded by the Department of Environment and Science and delivered by SRA in partnership with Sugar Services Proserpine.

