

Legume fallow

B17001

Burdekin

Growing legumes during the fallow will not only improve the long-term health of your soils, but is also one part of an effective farming system that has many other short and long-term benefits. Results from the Sugar Yield Decline Joint Venture project (SYDJV 1999–2007) illustrated that **legume breaks produce**:

- · Improvements in soil health through better balanced biology
- Fewer sugarcane root pathogens
- · Biologically-fixed nitrogen, which reduces the need for inorganic nitrogen fertiliser
- Better cane growth resulting in improved yield and profitability
- Soil structure improvement through taproot of legumes compared with the adventitious root system of sugarcane

**Below:** Cane yields from crops planted with plough-out replant and fallow planting system (SYDJV 2007).

Site and crop class	Cane yield (t/ha) in plough-out- replant system	Cane yield (t/ha) following legume fallow crop			
Tully (P)	88	102			
Ingham (P)	48	61			
Mackay (P)	63	90			
Mackay (R1)	92	116			
Bundaberg (P)	107	124			
Bundaberg (R1)	110	138			
Bundaberg (R2)	107	125			

**Below:** Cane yields from crops planted with plough-out replant and fallow planting system (SYDJV 2007).



**Above:** Cane plants comparison between crops planted following plough-out replant (PO/RO) and soy fallow (SYDJV 2017).

Treatment	Cane yield (t/ha)
Early cane plant, soybean crop incorporated	160.5
Late cane plant, soybean crop incorporated	120.3
Late cane plant, soybean crop harvested	125.5

Trials comparing soybeans, mungbeans, cowpea and peanuts demonstrated that soybeans were the most preferred legume as they produced more dry matter and accumulated the most nitrogen. (Garside *et al.* 2001). Nevertheless, other legumes and/or alternative fallow crops present other opportunities that should be considered (e.g. mungbeans short growing season and potential economic return). Since above mentioned work was conducted fallow options like sun hemp have become available, and mixed species fallow have been trialled on farms in the Herbert and Central regions.

Below: Calculation of N contribution from a legume crop (SYDJV Data).

Legume crop	Fallow crop dry mass (t/ha)	N%	Total N contribution (kg/ha)	N contribution if grain harvested (kg/ha)
	8		360	120
Souhoon	6	25	270	90
Soybean	4	5.5	180	60
	2		90	30
	8			125
Peanut	6	2	N/A	100
	4	5		65
	2			25
	8 290		290	100
Cowpea	6	2.0	220	75
	4	2.8	145	50
	2		70	25
	8		240	80
	6	2.2	180	60
Ladiad	4	2.3	120	40
	2		60	30

**Below:** Nitrogen returned for different legume species or management from experiments in North QLD (SYDJV Data).

Fallow management situation	Nitrogen input (kg/ha)			
Unmanaged cowpea	31			
Unmanaged lablab	76			
Well managed cowpea	140			
Well managed soybean	150-310			

Key findings from SRA/DAFF project Cropping solutions for the sugarcane farming systems of the Burdekin (2015077) highlighted that:

- The best yield results can be gained when sugarcane planting is maintained in autumn. Later planting times (July/August) are associated with cane yield declines in the Burdekin region.
- Short duration fallow crops such as mung bean and some soybean varieties can be harvested whilst maintaining sugarcane planting in the optimum autumn period.
- Legume residue management is important, as incorporation of green residue immediately prior to planting sugarcane had a negative effect on sugarcane yield.
- Extended fallow periods (17 months) had a positive effect on plant cane yields (~25%), however no difference was found in the ratoons.
- Grower gross margins were improved with the inclusion of a fallow cash crop into the sugarcane farming system.

Soybeans and mungbeans have been a popular choice of legume to plant during the fallow. In the Burdekin, sugarcane growers with long-standing legume fallow experience advocate that both soy and mungbeans have a place in the farming system. Generally, soy for the wetter and mung dryer time of the year. However, weather permitting, growers are also having success with mungs planted in January.

### Soybeans

Soybeans offer attractive opportunities for income diversification and improved cash flow. Using an equivalent five-year average price around **\$500/tonne for soybeans** (See graph opposite) and a yield potential in the Burdekin that can reach up to 4T/ha, **gross income of around \$2000/ha could be expected**. Conservative yield estimates of 2–2.5t/ha are recommended for budgeting purposes.

**Note:** Prices are indicative only – fluctuating on basis of annual market, crop grading and associated charges.





(Data sourced from http://www.indexmundi.com/commodities /?commodity=soybeans&months=60&currency=aud)

Whilst soybeans present agronomic and financial advantages as both green manure and harvested crop, a **choice of variety and good planning** (growing season to harvest maturity: 4–5 months) are critical to avoid planting cane too late.

Leichhardt and Stuart are generally recommended as the two commercially proven soybean varieties for the Central and Northern regions (QDAF). However, in a recent trial, Farmacist concluded that A6785 also proves to be a good choice for the Burdekin with comparable yield to Leichardt and crop maturity three weeks earlier. In the same trial, Bunya was also identified as an early crop but with significantly lower yield (Bunya can attract a premium price due to a clear hilum sought by the tofu market).

# **Below:** Fallow crop gross margins (SRA 2015 77 Data). Note: Cowpea crop = green manure

	Mung beans	Soy beans	Cow peas	Bare
Yield (t/ha)	1.8	4	0	0
On-farm price (mean, \$/t)	870	475	0	0
On-farm revenue (\$/ha)	1566	1900	0	0
Planting (\$/ha)	123	195	161	0
Crop nutrition (\$/ha)	0	0	0	0
Weed & pest control (\$/ha)	168	142	37	86
Irrigation (\$/ha)	99	148	63	0
Pre-harvest spray & harvesting (\$/ha)	128	148	0	0
Other (\$/ha)	50	50	118	0
Total variable cost (\$/ha)	568	683	379	86
Gross margin (\$/ha)	998	1217	-379	-86

# Mungbeans

As for soy, mungbeans offer interesting N and cash returns, with the added benefit of a shorter growing season (2–3 months). Current prices indicate **\$700-1000/tonne for mungbeans (2017)**. Using an average/conservative yield in the Burdekin around **two tonnes per hectare, gross income ranging between \$1400-2000/ha could be expected**.

**Note:** Prices are indicative only – fluctuating on basis of annual market, crop grading and associated charges.

**Below:** Cane yield following mung or soybean (SRA 2015 077): No significant difference in sugar yield after the plant crop following mung, soy or extended multispecies fallow.

Fallow Planting		Fallow species	Cane yield (t/ha)			Sugar yield (t/ha)				
length month (months)	month		Р	1R	2R	Total (P-2R)	Р	1R	2R	Total (P-2R)
6	April	Mungbean	157.6	167.1	132.7	457.4	22.4	25.8	20.2	68.4
7	May	Soybean	162.8	168.4	122.0	453.2	24.1	26.2	18.8	69.0
17	April	Soy-maize-mung	195.6	168.4	118.9	482.9	30.3	26.4	17.7	74.4
17	April	Cotton-maize-mung	182.2	171.0	115.8	469.0	26.8	27.7	17.8	72.3
LSD <sup>(0.05)</sup>			24.9	ns	ns	38.5	4.6	ns	ns	7.7



Below: Average mung yield (t/ha) of nine trials from September 2012 to September 2015 (CSIRO 2016).

	Years	Sowing time	Crystal t/ha	Jade t/ha
6 Trials	2012-15	Mid Aug – Late Sept	2.21	2.13
3 Trials	2013* & 15	Mid Jan – Early Feb	2.15	2.13

Range:

Crystal = 1.60 to 2.82 t/ha Jade = 1.62 to 2.62 t/ha No statistical difference in yield \*2014 crop/trial lost to birds and rain

Whilst shorter growing season gives an advantage over soybean in terms of earlier cane planting, **timely crop management is critical** (i.e. prediction three key growth stages – 1<sup>st</sup> flower, 1<sup>st</sup> mature pod and desiccation – plan key management activities e.g. early flowing irrigation vs last irrigation to set crop for harvest).

**Note:** If/when planting legumes for grain, engaging an agronomist is advised to undertake regular pests and diseases inspections (factor consultancy fees when budgeting).

### **Green manures**

#### Cowpea



Lablab







It is recommended to allow large biomass green manure crop/residue to break down before incorporating (more so on heavier soils) to prevent N draw down on following cane crop and possible allelopathic effect. Alternatively, incorporate green residue well before planting cane (6–8 weeks).

## **References and additional information**

Dowie. J (2013). Developing a robust soybean industry in central and northern Queensland – Results from the Burdekin district for the 2013 season. Farmacist report for the United Soybean Growers Group.

Drew. E (2012). Inoculating legumes: A practical guide. GRDC https://grdc.com.au/resources-and-publications/allpublications/bookshop/2015/07/inoculating-legumes

Garside. A, Bell. M (2006). Final Report – SRDC Project YDV002 Sugar Yield Decline Joint Venture Phase 2 (July 1999 – June 2006). http://elibrary.sugarresearch.com.au/handle/11079/1108

Garside. A, Bell. M, Halpin. N, Berthelsen. J (2001). Species and management of fallow legumes in sugarcane farming systems. Australian Society of Agronomy 2001.

Garside. A, Bell. M, Halpin. N, Berthelsen. J (2007). Soybeans in the sugarcane cropping system. SYDJV http://www. australianoilseeds.com/\_\_data/assets/pdf\_file/0016/2608/ Garside.pdf Gendry. J, (2011). *Mungbean management guide*. DEEDI. https://www.daf.qld.gov.au/plants/field-crops-and-pastures/ broadacre-field-crops/mungbeans/mungbean-managementguide-2011

QLD DAF. Soybeans for grain in coastal districts. https://www. daf.qld.gov.au/plants/field-crops-and-pastures/broadacrefield-crops/soybeans/growing-guide/coastal-soybeancropping-guidelines/grain-in-coastal-districts#Grain\_yields

QLD DAF. Mungbean production in Queensland. https://www. daf.qld.gov.au/plants/field-crops-and-pastures/broadacrefield-crops/mungbeans

Salter. B (2017). Final Report – SRA Project 2015077 Cropping solutions for the sugarcane farming systems of the Burdekin.

Yeates. S (2016). Mung bean agronomy update. CSIRO.

Young. R, Poggio. M (2007). A case study on the use of legume crop rotations in sugarcane. Future Cane.

Copyright © 2017 • 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 our directors, admits, escale to present information that is correct and accurate, we make no warranties, guarantees or representations about the sublicibility, reliability, currency or accuracy of the information spectro for any purposes. Subject to any terms implied by law and which cannot be excluded, we accept no responsibility for anylo, so damage, cost or expense in current do by ou 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. 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 Discussion Sheet. We recommend that you contact our staff before acting on any information provided in this Discussion 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.