

# Collapse of Doha round improves likelihood of farm bill movement

With the collapse of the Doha world-trade talks in July, new momentum has been given to congressional lawmakers already involved in and supportive of a hard-fought farm-bill rewrite. This is in spite of broad backing by the agriculture community for an extension of existing farm subsidy rates until a successful Doha round is concluded.

The disappointing implosion of Doha culminated five years of World Trade Organization (WTO) nations' efforts to achieve an expansion of market access for U.S. agriculture in exchange for limits imposed on U.S. and European Union (EU) farm subsidies, in addition to other trade expansions. Legislators were planning strategies in response to predicted new farm subsidy rules to be established during the debate over reauthorizing the 2002 farm bill, which expires in fall 2007. Nevertheless, with the indefinite suspension of talks on July 24, when the EU would not match subsidy cuts proposed by the U.S., there is only the remotest of possibilities that Doha will be revived until after passage of the next farm bill.

Both the American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) and National Farmers Union (NFU) have supported House and Senate proposals to extend the 2002 farm bill until Congress approves legislation to implement new world trade rules. Supporting their position were Representatives Collin Peterson (D-MN) and Mac Thornberry (R-TX) who each introduced bills, which, if passed, would have delayed farm bill debate until completion of Doha. Senator Jim Talent (R-MO) introduced a similar version of the bills in the Senate.

Following the collapse of Doha, AFBF president Bob Stallman announced, "With the suspension of the Doha Round of WTO trade talks on agriculture, the time has come for



Once the Doha round of trade negotiations at the World Trade Organization's meetings broke down at the end of July, U.S. lawmakers are looking to extend the current farm bill before it expires in the fall of 2007.

American agriculture to clearly focus on the need to extend our farm program for at least one year. By extending the current farm program, with minor changes to take into account recent trade rulings, we will move forward with the kind of policy that helps ensure U.S. farmers have the support they need to survive in today's contentious global trading environment. We will encourage leaders from both houses of Congress to work together toward an extension of our farm law."

Tom Buis, NFU president, concurred with Stallman, referring to the shaky financial situation for the farm economy due to high energy prices. He said, "With that scenario,

the shaky political division in Congress in an election year ... federal budget issues because of deficit, and you throw in the trade issues, a lot of people think an extension is the best bet.”

Regardless of the failed Doha talks, House Agriculture Committee Chairman, Bob Goodlatte (R-VA), not a fan of applying an extension to 2002 subsidy rates, continues to favor action on a new farm bill. If anything, the failure of Doha has only accelerated the pace of the agriculture committee, which concluded its 13th farm bill hearing in Scottsburg, Ind., on July 24. In addition, chairman Goodlatte has launched a Web-based farm bill feedback form on the agriculture committee's Web site: [www.agriculture.house.gov/inside/feedbackform.html](http://www.agriculture.house.gov/inside/feedbackform.html).

Meanwhile, in the upper chamber, Senate Agriculture Committee Chairman Saxby Chambliss (R-GA), also not supportive of an extension of the 2002 farm bill, conducted field hearings earlier this summer to receive input from stakeholders. The focus of the hearings was

on the commodity and conservation programs and miscellaneous other “farmer-focused” programs.

Despite Doha's derailment and the uncertainty of renewed discussions, the possible future WTO disputes over subsidies, and a push by AFBF and NFU and much of the agriculture sector for a 2002 farm bill extension, Agriculture Secretary Mike Johanns is urging Congress to begin reauthorizing the farm bill. The Bush administration's support, combined with congressional interest in farm bill reauthorization, makes it appear likely that some movement toward reauthorization of the 2002 farm bill, which includes commodity, conservation, research, education and Extension among other programs, will occur soon.

No doubt, the American Society of Agronomy and Certified Crop Advisers, building on past successful efforts to obtain eligibility for CCAs as Technical Service Providers in the Conservation Title of the 2002 farm bill, will play a very active role in these developments. **AG**

## Outgoing chairman's perspectives



Chairman,  
Fred Vocasek

Over time, I have seen the CCA board meetings evolve and change on both a local and international level. We now spend much less time on the fine details of certification (like exam scoring or CEU tracking) and more time on moving the CCA certification forward and on pursuing potential opportunities.

It seems to be paying off. More and more, we find that CCAs are being given a place at the table during farm policy discussions by regulators, by state agencies and others. CCAs are being recognized as an important link in the food production chain.

This all goes to the issue of value. We all hear the question, “What is the value of the CCA certification?” I really wish I could put a net return on being a CCA—that you can get \$2 or \$5 or \$10 back for every dollar spent on certification. I can't do that.

I do believe the CCA certification is a key that helps unlock certain doors. Whether an

individual CCA opens those doors to explore potential opportunities, then to profit, is up to them. The job of your leadership—either at the international level or at the local level—is to seek out and develop those opportunities. You as an individual determine the final value of the CCA.

We must not forget that as the CCA value increases, so does the individual responsibility. A challenge to future CCA leadership is to assure that the structure and organization is in place to assure that we maintain quality in our certification in all aspects.

In October 1992, I sat in a room in Topeka, Kan., to help organize our state CCA board. At that time, I never expected to be writing an outgoing ICCA chairman's column today. Thank you all for the opportunity to serve as your chairman.



# Northwest CCA update

The Northwest Certified Crop Adviser (NWCCA) Program continues to grow. NWCCA was the first multi-state region in the CCA program. We started with combining Idaho, Oregon and Washington into one 'state' board.

Because many of the participants of the program were field personnel of multi-state retail operations, it made sense to coordinate the activities into one oversight board. Also, the critical mass necessary to operate a successful program made the multi-state program make sense. Since then, Utah, Nevada and British Columbia have been added to the Northwest Region.

Earlier in 2006, Alaska petitioned to join NWCCA, too. Curtis Dunkin, programs coordinator with the Alaska Soil and Water Conservation Palmer District, has been instrumental in exploring the certification program.

"I felt professionals like me could do a better job of serving our grower clients by becoming a CCA," he says. "Alaska is unique with the type of agriculture we have here. Thus, anything we can do to help our growers is a benefit to us all."

In June, NWCCA administrative agent, Scott McKinnie, visited with key leaders in Alaska about the program. Unlike the 'lower 48,' most of the assistance growers receive regarding crop recommendations comes from either the Extension Service or the Soil and Water Conservation Districts. Thus attendees at a series of meetings held were from those constituencies.

Discussion points at these meetings centered on the parameters of the CCA program. Because Alaska agriculture is different than the rest of the NWCCA area, an exam that would include some specific references to Alaska agriculture may be needed. Also under review are the performance objectives for NWCCA and how the current document fits the needs of Alaska.

Once individuals have been certified, there is a need to create CCA accredited events. Organic crops are increasing in demand, thus, using CCA as a way of working with organic growers was reviewed.

A discussion was held with Alaska Director of Agriculture Larry Devilbiss at ADA offices in Palmer, Alaska. He saw CCA as fitting the needs of Alaska agriculture. He felt the program could update practices, provide best management recommendations and improve farm operations in general.

The chair of the Soil and Water Conservation Palmer District says getting CCA into Alaska may assist in getting agriculture better recognized by the regulatory and legislative community. Often, ag is at the bottom of the list, he says.

Although the retail fertilizer and agrichemical dealers by and large do not advise growers directly on crop inputs, that does not mean there isn't an interest. Ken Sherwood of Alaska Mill and Feed in Anchorage says, "Soil fertility, crop and nutrient management expertise is very valuable and greatly needed in the state. It is important we have certified and knowledgeable individuals making sound recommendations."

CCA is just getting off the ground in Alaska. However, the interest is there to get a program established. To date, there are 15 to 20 Extension and/or Soil Conservation District professionals who are interested in obtaining CCA certification. Work needs to be done to address the exam and development of CCA-approved courses. NWCCA is proud to have Alaska in the program and will work to make it successful.

Just as there are recognized certification programs in just about every other professional field, this certification program for agriculture has merit. It is your investment in your future and in your credibility. And that is why you should be a CCA. **AG**

BY SCOTT  
McKINNIE



## CCA ADVANTAGE

Continuing Education  
Self-Study Course

# WINTER COVER EVALUATION OF ECOPHYSIO

BY FERNANDO E. MIGUEZ AND GERMAN A. BOLLERO

Integrating winter cover crops (WCC) in a cropping system provides benefits that can result in enhanced crop yield. Although it is important to recognize that WCC can increase corn yield and provide environmental benefits, management practices need to be adapted to specific regions and cropping systems to increase the positive effects of WCC on corn yield and the environment. Correspondingly, in cropping systems where use of WCC may result in lower corn yields, possible negative effects need to be decreased.

In Illinois, a statewide average of 4,300,000 ha (10,600,000 acres) of corn were planted annually between 1993 and 2002, and each year at least 175 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (156 lb/A) of nitrogen fertilizer was used in 94 percent of the planted area.

Bollero and Bullock showed that corn yield increase due to hairy vetch did not compensate economically for the cost of the seed, planting operations and herbicide application. Further research showed that hairy vetch and/or rye alone do not provide sufficient nitrogen to optimize corn grain yields. However, the previous studies indicated that management tools such as fertilization and the WCC kill date need to be adapted to a specific region and cropping system.

Ruffo and Bollero concluded that in this region killing cereal rye one week before planting corn was not optimal for adequate synchronization between nitrogen release from the residue and nitrogen demand for corn. Crandall et al. evaluated kill date and fertilization strategies with the goal of improving the synchronization of nitrogen demand for corn and supply from the cropping system while minimizing

nitrogen losses. They concluded that applying nitrogen fertilizer at planting and killing cereal rye two weeks before planting corn produced yields comparable to corn following no cover.

Most importantly, Crandall et al. showed that through adequate management practices, crop productivity can be maintained and negative effects to the environment can be reduced, thus suggesting that these are not conflicting goals.

Evaluating ecophysiological characteristics of corn under WCCs can lead to improved management decisions that maximize positive effects and minimize negative effects associated with the use of WCCs. In the future, this may promote a greater acceptance of WCCs among Illinois farmers who may need to comply with state laws to reduce the use of fertilizer, address soil erosion and/or reduce the use of other agrochemicals. The objective of this study was to examine corn development, growth and yield through the evaluation of ecophysiological characteristics (i.e., morphological characteristics, development, light interception (LI), carbon exchange, chlorophyll readings, and yield components) of corn following WCC and a no-cover control.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Field Site and Method.** This two-year field experiment was conducted at Urbana, Ill., during 2002 and 2003. The soil is a Drummer silty clay loam. The experiment was conducted using no-till practices in plots that were previously in corn-soybean rotation for at least seven years. Winter cover crops were drilled on soybean stubble

in adjacent fields each year. Corn was planted using 76-cm (30-inch) row spacing on May 1, 2002, and April 29, 2003.

### Morphological Characteristics.

In 2003, selected morphological characteristics of corn were recorded: height (from the ground to the base of the uppermost fully expanded leaf), number of fully expanded leaves and area of the uppermost fully expanded leaf. The area of the uppermost fully expanded leaf was calculated as maximum leaf length  $\times$  maximum leaf width  $\times$  0.75.

Two plants per plot were randomly selected in each subplot for these measurements.

### Chlorophyll Meter Readings.

Corn nitrogen status was evaluated using a chlorophyll meter. Readings were taken on the uppermost fully expanded leaf with a visible collar during vegetative growth and from the ear leaf during reproductive growth. A subsample of 10 corn plants was measured around R1 in each subplot.

**Light Interception.** The photosynthetic active radiation (PAR,  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$ ) intercepted by the crop was recorded using a 0.8-meter-long Sunfleck PAR Ceptometer.

Measurements were taken on cloudless days between 1100 and 1400 hours when the external sensor read at least 1400  $\mu\text{mol m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}$  photosynthetic photon flux density (PPFD). Light interception (LI) is reported as a percentage of the PAR intercepted by the corn crop over the PAR recorded by an external sensor.

**Leaf Carbon Dioxide Exchange Rate.** Leaf carbon dioxide exchange rates (CER), ( $\mu\text{mol CO}_2 \text{ m}^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ ) were measured using a portable, open-flow

# CROPS IN ILLINOIS

## LOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF CORN

gas exchange system LI-6400. An area of 6 cm<sup>2</sup> (1 square inch) that did not include the midrib was chosen on a sun-lit fully expanded leaf.

### **Yield and Yield Components**

**Methods.** The two and four central rows of each plot in 2002 and 2003, respectively, were mechanically harvested. Yield was corrected for moisture at 155 g kg<sup>-1</sup> (15.5%). Three corn plants were collected before harvest (avoiding the center rows) to determine yield components. Plants were dried to a constant weight at 65°C (150°F) and stems, leaves and kernels were weighed. Kernel number and weight were also determined for each sample.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Winter Cover Crop**

**Biomass.** Biomass production of WCCs differed substantially between years. A possible reason for this difference was planting dates. Because of weather conditions in 2001, WCCs were planted a month later than in 2002. These differences in biomass production show the widely reported importance of early fall planting for successful WCC establishment and biomass production. This is especially true for hairy vetch, which is more susceptible to winterkill than rye. Although hairy vetch winterkill was not specifically measured in this study, the low biomass production indicates that plants were lost. However, the biomass for the other WCCs was also low, suggesting that conditions were not ideal for WCC growth.

Hairy vetch biomass showed a similar range compared with other studies in Illinois. In this study, the average carbon/nitrogen (C/N) ratio

was 12 and 14 for 2002 and 2004, respectively. These values are lower than the average 17 reported by Ruffo and Bollero for Illinois. The C/N ratio of the rye in monoculture and biculture is lower than the values reported in Ruffo and Bollero, probably as a result of the different management.

Killing rye two weeks earlier is a compromise between the biomass produced and the lower C/N ratio. A lower C/N in the rye in monoculture reduced the negative effects due to immobilization. Probably, if rye were killed two weeks later, the C/N ratio would be much higher and closer to 25. The low C/N ratios reported here are similar to those in Ruffo et al. for the higher nitrogen fertilizer rate (NFR).

### **Corn Morphological**

**Characteristics.** The results of the analysis of corn morphological characteristics demonstrate that rye in monoculture had detrimental effects on corn development. The differences found in leaf number, height and leaf area indicate that corn following rye resulted in a smaller plant and consequently a reduced canopy, which probably led to lower efficiency in intercepting solar radiation. However, most of the detrimental effects were observed at 0 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> (0 lbs/A) and these negative effects were partially or completely overcome by adding 90 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup> (80 lbs/A). There were no negative effects at higher NFR. This suggests that rye in monoculture not only did not effectively supply nitrogen to corn but rather caused immobilization of nitrogen and consequently nitrogen deficiency.

We hypothesize that, in this study, allelopathic effects were not the main



reason why rye had detrimental effects on corn development, because rye in monoculture was killed two weeks and rye in biculture one week before planting corn, and negative effects were clearer for rye in the monoculture. We would expect to encounter larger negative effects due to allelopathy where more rye biomass was present and when there was less time for compounds to leach. It is possible that below-ground biomass, which was not measured in this study, was responsible for the negative effects of rye on corn growth.

The effect of hairy vetch-rye biculture on corn development was intermediate to the effects of rye and



hairy vetch in monoculture or no cover. It is likely that the detrimental effects of hairy vetch-rye biculture on corn development can be attributed to the negative influence of rye as discussed above. However, the different management (i.e., later kill date) for the hairy vetch-rye biculture provided a greater dry biomass for both components of the biculture.

The contribution of hairy vetch to the biculture probably resulted in a greater nitrogen supply and a more balanced C/N ratio of the combined residue, and consequently a lower potential for nitrogen immobilization. Ideally, a hairy vetch-rye biculture can provide corn with benefits associated with both components, but in this study, corn development following hairy vetch-rye was not optimal compared with the response to no cover or hairy vetch in monoculture.

In Illinois, management of hairy vetch-rye biculture will require a minimum of 80 lbs/A to minimize the negative effects that are likely associated with rye. However, as shown in other states, the inclusion of rye in the biculture can be desirable because rye is more effective than hairy vetch in taking up residual nitrogen, and thus better reduces the potential for nitrogen loss from the cropping system.

**Corn Biomass.** Dry biomass of corn was affected by the preceding WCC for the combined analysis of years. Small differences in corn dry biomass early in the season, as shown for the morphological characteristics, were more pronounced at later stages of corn development. Corn following hairy vetch achieved a larger dry biomass than corn following other WCCs or no cover, but these differences were statistically significant only at harvest. The difference between corn following hairy vetch and corn following no cover at harvest cannot easily be explained by any of

the morphological variables analyzed. However, these variables focused on the early development of corn, and the observed differences might be a result of ecophysiological changes that occurred later in corn development.

**Carbon Dioxide Exchange Rate.** The results of corn development and LI raise the question of how corn growth rate responded to WCCs. As for LI, statistical differences and differences in magnitude in CER were mainly found for corn that received no nitrogen fertilizer. At 0 nitrogen, corn following hairy vetch maintained CER comparable with higher NFR, while corn following rye had significantly reduced CER at no nitrogen. Corn following no cover and hairy vetch-rye biculture achieved intermediate CER.

These results reflect the growth rate of corn in the period before silking, which has been recognized as a critical period for kernel set, which is in turn closely associated with corn grain yield. The higher values of LI, combined with higher CERs, provided corn following hairy vetch an advantage over corn following any other WCC or no cover. Thus, although hairy vetch increased soil nitrogen availability to corn, it was not enough to provide the entire nitrogen needed for achieving high levels of LI.

**Corn Yield and Yield Components.** The predicted equations for corn grain yield for years combined as anticipated by the analysis of ecophysiological characteristics show that the largest differences were found at lower NFR. Although nonsignificant, the magnitude of the difference in corn grain yield following hairy vetch and no cover was 1.1 Mg ha<sup>-1</sup> (0.5 tons/A). Moreover, there were no significant differences between the intercept and the linear parameter of the regression equations for corn

following hairy vetch and no cover. Even though differences in corn yield for corn following hairy vetch at low NFR could be a result of higher LI and CER, it is not entirely clear what mechanisms are responsible for the difference observed between corn following hairy vetch and no cover at higher NFR.

Clark et al. found that hairy vetch residue was more effective in conserving soil moisture than no cover. Therefore, it is possible that in this study some of the beneficial effects attributed to hairy vetch are associated with improved soil moisture conservation. There were differences in corn grain yield between years. It is clear that two years do not provide a reliable estimate for this variance component, and that much of the variability in this study is due to factors that differed between years. Probably the two factors that varied the most were the precipitation in July and the dry biomass production by WCCs. More years of experimentation are needed to estimate the effects of highly variable annual weather patterns. In addition, a better approach to this issue is combining the results of studies which considered similar treatments using appropriate statistical methods.

Kernel number and weight increased with nitrogen fertilizer. As with previous variables, kernel number and weight only differed among WCCs when no nitrogen fertilizer was applied and as NFRs increased differences among WCCs were nonsignificant. Also, corn following hairy vetch had the highest mean for kernel number and weight, and corn following rye had the lowest.

In summary, the analysis of ecophysiological characteristics of corn following WCCs and no cover revealed that corn following hairy vetch was superior to all other treatments when no nitrogen fertilizer

was applied. The fact that most observed differences disappeared with nitrogen fertilizer suggests that most of the beneficial effects of hairy vetch are due to an improved soil nitrogen availability. However, in the regression analysis for grain yield, although the parameters were not statistically different, corn following hairy vetch yielded more than following no cover, suggesting that there might be beneficial effects associated with hairy vetch that are not solely due to nitrogen supply.

On the other hand, rye and hairy vetch-rye biculture had detrimental effects on corn, and this was almost always true when no nitrogen fertilizer was applied. No nitrogen fertilizer is an unrealistic scenario for

most farmers, and there were very few cases in which the negative effects were not overcome by application of 80 lbs/A N, which is below the average NFR used by Illinois farmers.

It is encouraging that the management practices used in this study did not cause negative effects on corn development and yield as long as at least 80 lbs/A N were applied. Thus, incorporating WCCs in a corn-soybean rotation in Illinois could provide environmental services without affecting corn yield potential. Furthermore, if hairy vetch is incorporated, the yield potential of corn might even increase above what would be expected under the prevalent cropping system in Illinois in which WCCs are not used. **AG**

### TO GET YOUR CEU CREDIT

The quiz to the self-study CEU article can be found online at Ag Professional's Web site in the CCA Advantage section. A PDF of the exam and mailing information is available.

You can earn a CEU credit in Crop Management for completing the test associated with this article. Go to <http://www.agprofessional.com/ccaadvantage.php> and select the article and quiz at the top.

If you do not have access to the Internet and want the quiz mailed to you, write to the American Society of Agronomy (ASA) c/o CCA Self-Study Exam, 677 S. Segoe Road, Madison, WI 53711, or call (608) 273-8080.

# Treat every seed equally



Accuracy and dependability comes with proven Gustafson treatment equipment. Learn more about capacities,\* speed and other models at [www.gustafson.com/gustafson\\_equipment](http://www.gustafson.com/gustafson_equipment). Or, call 800-634-6738 to treat all your customers' seeds equally.



**ACCU-TREAT® RH-24**  
Continuous flow rotary seed wheel metering, direct injection up to 4 products, capacity up to 800 bushels/hour\*



**SRW-800**  
Continuous flow commercial seed/seed treatment metering, capacity up to 800 bushels/hour\*



**HCBT-800**  
Continuous flow volumetric seed/seed treatment metering, capacity up to 800 bushels/hour\*



**CS-1700**  
Compact volumetric seed/seed treatment with capacities up to 1,400 bushels/hour\*

**Gustafson**  
EQUIPMENT



©2006 Bayer CropScience, 2 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. Always read and follow label instructions. D6415-AP BCSDEQST226

 Bayer CropScience



# Winter cover crops in Illinois: Evaluation of ecophysiological characteristics of corn September Self-Study Examination

**1. Winter cover crops have been recognized as an effective strategy for**

- a. decreasing crop input costs.
- b. maintaining nitrogen in the cropping system.
- c. equalizing variations in soil pH.
- d. releasing soil organic carbon.

**2. Bollero and Bullock concluded in an earlier study that**

- a. corn yield increases from using a vetch WCC did not pay for the cost of seed and associated field operations.
- b. hairy vetch and rye, if planted early, can provide sufficient N for optimum corn grain yields.
- c. corn planting rates need to be increased to compensate for poor planting conditions.
- d. mid-summer seedings are superior for the establishment of either vetch or rye.

**3. A feature of corn production in Illinois includes**

- a. about 12 million hectares planted annually.
- b. winter cover crops planted on most acres.
- c. at least 156 lb/A of nitrogen used on the majority of corn acres.
- d. dark prairie soils where nitrogen leaching is of little concern.

**4. Parameters measured in this study included**

- a. soil nitrate content.
- b. crop oxygen evolution.
- c. kernel number counts.
- d. crop root mass measurements.

**5. A characteristic of the study methods was**

- a. multiple locations across Southern Illinois.
- b. a variety of crops and crop rotations.
- c. conventional tillage.
- d. check plots that had no cover crops planted.

**6. A possible reason for the differences in biomass production of the winter cover crops between years was the**

- a. planting dates of cover crops.
- b. planting dates of the corn crop.
- c. differences in seed sources.
- d. herbicide differences in previous crops.

**7. As compared to rye, a characteristic of hairy vetch is that it**

- a. can provide more nitrogen to following crops.
- b. is more winter hardy.
- c. can be planted and managed less expensively.
- d. competes more vigorously with corn.

**8. A reason for the differences in corn morphology among different cover crop treatments was**

- a. allelopathic effects between the rye and corn.
- b. nitrogen tie-up.
- c. early-season shading and competition of cover crops.
- d. crop leaf diseases from cover crops serving as hosts.

**9. With no nitrogen fertilizer, the performance of corn was best when following**

- a. rye cover crops.
- b. no cover.
- c. hairy vetch.
- d. a hairy vetch/rye combination.

**10. For farmers using at least 80 lbs/A N, incorporating a WCC into their cropping system should**

- a. not cause negative effects on corn development or yield.
- b. increase yields.
- c. decrease expenses.
- d. eliminate environmental concerns regarding nitrogen.

DETACH HERE