# Sugar Beets and Safflower as Alternative Winter Forages





2020 S. SJV Alfalfa and Forages Virtual Field Day September 23, 2020 Steve Kaffka\*, Plant Sciences, UC Davis Peter Robinson, Animal Sciences, UC Davis Cameron Pittelkow, UC Davis Gene Aksland, Agronomic Services, Visalia Nick Clark, UCCE, Tulare County

Sponsored by:

CALIFORNIA DAIRY RESEARCH FOUNDATION Science for a Sustainable Future



Nestle Good Food, Good Life



Thanks to the Fernandes Family and the Legacy Dairy, and the Wilbur Family and the Rio Blanco Dairy, Staas Brothers and Gombos Brothers





Growing sugarbeets and SB/almond hull silage

Growing safflower and safflower silage

Regulatory issues affecting farming and the state's dairy industry

The dairy industry in California may be the most efficient and lowest GHG emitting dairy systems anywhere, but are threatened by constraints on manure nutrient use and declining irrigation water supplies in the future. What might be done to help meet stricter regulatory requirements in the future?

10

-8

-10

Drawdown

1995

1988–2002 average overdraft: 1.3 maf/year

2000

1988 1990



Figure 3. Nitrogen loading is particularly high on croplands fertilized with dairy manure



#### Figure 1. Groundwater overdraft in the San Joaquin Valley has accelerated in recent years

#### Nitrate pollution of groundwater

### Ground water overdraft

2005

2010

2003–2017 average overdraft: 2.4 maf/year

2015 2017

SOURCE: Public Policy Institute of California\_<u>https://www.ppic.org/publication/water-and-the-future-of-the-san-joaquin-valley/</u>





**Can deep-rooted** crops, grown in winter, be used strategically to **improve** water and nutrient management while also providing high quality feed?

**This deep-rooted character makes beets more water use efficient and will help with nitrate management**. The figure above was measured changes (depletion) of volumetric soil water content with depth on a Panoche clay loam at the UC WSREC in western Fresno County. Water (and nutrient) recovery were measured at 9 feet deep in the profile.



Sugarbeet canopy on Legacy Dairy, April, 2019. **Beets were** planted on October 24, 2018 and harvested on June 25, 2019.



#### Jeff Wilbur and Gene Aksland, May 14, 2020



Beet foliage. No evidence of disease or insect damage of any kind. Very vigorous foliage and root development. Roundup used to control weeds.

| Legacy Dairy (2018-19) |         |      |  |  |
|------------------------|---------|------|--|--|
| Root yields            |         |      |  |  |
| average SD             |         |      |  |  |
|                        | t FW/ac |      |  |  |
| Field                  | 58.7    | 10.9 |  |  |
| Beta                   | 51.5    | 6.5  |  |  |
| Holly                  | 64.5    | 10.4 |  |  |

Root yields were higher than (conservatively) expected but consistent with current high yields in the IV of California. Tops were not used for feed but returned to the soil. If fed, care would be needed due to high nitrate levels.

| Top and crown yields |      |      |  |
|----------------------|------|------|--|
| t FW/ac              |      |      |  |
| Field                | 16.5 | 5.75 |  |
| Beta                 | 13.2 | 5    |  |
| Holly                | 19.6 | 6.4  |  |





Co-ensiling sugarbeet roots and almond hulls Legacy Dairy June 26, 2019

TITLE

The dry matter (DM) of the silage mass attained (~33%) was slightly below the target of 37% due to a lower than expected DM content of the sugarbeet roots. Beets fermented easily and were stable in Ag bags. Proximate analyses of feed values were within expected ranges, although nitrate-N levels were moderately high. The NE<sub>1</sub> value, ~0.66 Mcal/lb DM, was similar to that of corn silage. When incorporated in rations for lactating dairy cattle, the cows were observed to readily consume the silage and even to seek out beet pieces.

|                                   | Sample Site on the Ag Bag |       |                                     |                              |       |              |  |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|--------------|--|
| Location                          | Lower (A)                 |       | Midd                                | Middle (B)                   |       | Top (C)      |  |
|                                   | (1 ft above grade)        |       | ( <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> way u | $(^{1}/_{2}$ way up the bag) |       | (Top of bag) |  |
| Core Depth                        | Outer                     | Inner | Outer                               | Inner                        | Outer | Inner        |  |
|                                   | 05.0                      | 02 5  | 05.0                                | 04.6                         | 07.2  | 07 5         |  |
|                                   | 95.0                      | 92.5  | 95.0                                | 94.0                         | 97.2  | 97.5         |  |
| Density (lbs/ft <sup>°</sup> )    | 47.1                      | 78.5  | 27.5                                | 53.2                         | 31.0  | 49.6         |  |
| Density (lbs DM/ft <sup>°</sup> ) | 11.4                      | 24.5  | 8.8                                 | 17.5                         | 9.2   | 17.5         |  |
| Dry matter (%)                    | 24.1                      | 31.2  | 32.0                                | 32.9                         | 29.6  | 35.3         |  |
| Yeast (cfu ,000)                  | 1133                      | -     | 282                                 | -                            | <100  | -            |  |
| Yeast (cfu: ,000)                 | <100                      | -     | <100                                | -                            | <100  | -            |  |
| рН                                | 3.92                      | 3.88  | 3.95                                | 3.96                         | 3.97  | 4.01         |  |
| Acids (% DM)                      |                           |       |                                     |                              |       |              |  |
| Lactic                            | -                         | 7.1   | -                                   | 7.1                          | -     | 6.0          |  |
| Acetic                            | -                         | 2.1   | -                                   | 1.9                          | -     | 1.5          |  |
| Butyric                           | -                         | <0.01 | -                                   | <0.01                        | -     | <0.01        |  |
| Propionic                         | -                         | 0.03  | -                                   | <0.01                        | -     | 0.03         |  |
| Succinic                          | -                         | 0.07  | -                                   | 0.07                         | -     | 0.07         |  |
| Formic                            | -                         | 0.20  | -                                   | 0.22                         | -     | 0.22         |  |
| Ethanol (% DM)                    | -                         | 3.4   | -                                   | 3.0                          | -     | 3.1          |  |
| Ash (% DM)                        | -                         | 13.3  | -                                   | 12.3                         | -     | 14.0         |  |
| Crude protein (% DM)              | -                         | 7.6   | -                                   | 7.5                          | -     | 7.2          |  |
| Ammonia N (ppm DM)                | -                         | 1300  | -                                   | 1200                         | -     | 900          |  |
| Nitrate N (ppm DM)                | -                         | 955   | -                                   | 752                          | -     | 898          |  |
| aNDF (% DM)                       | -                         | 25.4  | -                                   | 26.7                         | -     | 26.9         |  |
| WSC (% DM)                        | -                         | 14.5  | -                                   | 12.5                         | -     | 15.8         |  |
| NFC (% DM)                        | -                         | 53    | -                                   | 53                           | -     | 51           |  |
| NE <sub>I</sub> (Mcal/lb DM)      | -                         | 0.67  | -                                   | 0.66                         | -     | 0.65         |  |

Composition of the Sugar Beet/Almond Hull Co-Ensiled Silage ~60 d Post Ensiling

| Costs Per Acre To Produce Sugar Beet Forage  |                         |                     |                  |                   |                |  |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|
|  | Legacy Ra               | inch D'an y, i b    | Fuel             |                   |                |  |
| <b>Operation</b><br>Strip Till post corn silage<br>Strip Till Prep for planting  | Operation time<br>Hr/Ac | Labor Cost<br>Costs | Lub &<br>Repairs | Material<br>Costs | Custom<br>Rent | Total<br>Cost<br>30<br>15                          |
| Plant Sugar beets seed cost<br>Glyphosate weed control 3X  | 0.33                    | 3.18                | 7.66             | 100               | 0              | 111.17<br>66                                       |
| Irrigate 6 X<br>Irrigation water   | 11.25                   | 64.12               | 0                | 55.5<br>150       | 0              | 100<br>150   |
| Pickup Truck use   | 0.1                     | 2.85                | 2.86             | 0                 | 0              | 5.71   |
| Total Cultural Costs   | 11.68                   | 70.15               | 10.52            | 305.5             | 0              | 477.88   |
| Topping and Digging  | 0                       | 0                   | 0                | 0                 | 49             | 49   |
| subtotal<br>Interest on Operating Capital<br>@5.75%  |                         |                     |                  |                   |                | 526.88<br>15                                       |
| Total Operating Costs / Acre   | e                       | 176.94              | 126.13           | 461.92            | 120.7          | 541.88   |
| Liability Insurance<br>Office expence<br>Field Sanitation<br>Property taxes<br>Property insurance<br>Investment repairs<br>Rent share @ 16% of Gross |                         |                     |                  |                   |                | 0.3<br>30<br>0.52<br>4.08<br>2.91<br>1.3<br>138.65 |
| Total Cash overhead costs  |                         |                     |                  |                   |                | 177.76   |
| Total non-cash overhead  |                         |                     |                  |                   |                | 39   |
| Total Costs/Acre   |                         |                     |                  |                   |                | 758.64   |

| tons/ac   | Cost/t | Bagging costs     |  |  |
|---|--------|-------------------|--|--|
| luns/ac   | beets  | Plus almond hulls |  |  |
| 25  | 30.35  | 66.33             |  |  |
| 30  | 25.29  | 61.27             |  |  |
| 35  | 21.68  | 57.66             |  |  |
| 40  | 18.97  | 54.95             |  |  |
| 45  | 16.86  | 52.84             |  |  |
| 50  | 15.17  | 51.15             |  |  |
| 55  | 13.79  | 49.77             |  |  |
| 60  | 12.64  | 48.62             |  |  |
| Production costs = \$760/ac; almond hulls<br>were added at cost of \$35.25/t of beets |        |                   |  |  |
|   |        |                   |  |  |
|   |        |                   |  |  |
|   |        |                   |  |  |
|   |        |                   |  |  |
|   |        |                   |  |  |

## UC Davis: November 2019 to April 2020









**Project management**: Safflower (Seedtec-S535) was planted with a grain drill on the UC Davis campus farm on October 31, 2019 and irrigated on November 11 to help with germination in the absence of rainfall. There were no further irrigations and all crop growth was based on rainfall and stored soil moisture from previous years. Rainfall = 12.7 inches (67% of normal), with most falling in December. Treflan was used as a pre-plant herbicide. There were no other pest management practices applied. Samples were collected starting in early February and then approximately monthly until a full harvest for silage was made on April 29. Small plots were left and subsamples collected on May 23, when the experiment was terminated. Soil moisture and crop water use was monitored using neutron access tubes and a neutron source from February until the end of the trial.



February 28, 2020, High N plot; Left: subsample; Right: neutron access tube (soil water depletion sample site)

