Catalyst Project Report

Grower Information	
Grower Name:	Allan Matsen
Entity Name:	CLEARACRE PTY LTD
Trial Farm No/Name:	MKY-04671A
Mill Area:	Mackay Sugar
Total Farm Area ha:	474
No. Years Farming:	
Trial Subdistrict:	Dawlish
Area under Cane ha:	414

Background Information

Aim:
To reduce the amount of nutrient applied following low rates of mill mud without negatively impacting growth.

Background:
Mill mud contains a large number of nutrients, some of which are in quite high concentrations. It also has the capacity to act as a soil ameliorant and aid in soil structure. Following the application of large rates of mill mud it is common to decrease nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus.

There is little knowledge about how much fertiliser can be reduced after mill mud is applied at low rates. This trial will investigate different application rates of nutrients following low mill mud application to determine what is required for the following plant cane crop.

Potential Water Quality Benefit:
Reduced nutrients applied to the paddocks therefore less in runoff

Expected Outcome of Trial:
Consistent yields between mud treatments and full fertiliser treatments.

Service provider contact: Farmacist

Where did this idea come from: Grower

Plan - Project Activities	Date : (mth/year to be undertaken)	Activities :(breakdown of each activity for each stage)
Stage 1	**October 2017**	Collect soil samples and mill mid samples for analysis. Install KP samplers to measure water quality in runoff
Stage 2	**April 2018**	Soybean biomasss samples
Stage 3	**February 2019**	Sugarcane biomass
Stage 4	**September 2018**	Harvest trial
Stage 5		
Stage 6		

Project Trial site details

Trial Crop:	Soybean and sugarcane
Variety: Rat/Plt:	
Trial Block No/Name:	MKY04670A block 8-2
Trial Block Size Ha:	8.4
Trial Block Position (GPS):	149.151356, -21.394182
Soil Type:	Sunnyside - grey-olive duplex soil

Block History, Trial Design:

Repetition		1			2			3			
Treatment	Guard	2	1	3	3	2	1	1	3	2	Guard
No Rows	rest of blk	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	3

1. No Mud
2. Mud Surface Applied at 100t/ha
3. Mud Sub-Surface Applied at 100t/ha

Treatments:
1. No mud
2. Mud applied on the surface at 100t/ha
3. **Mud applied sub-surface at 100t/ha**

Conclusions and comments

Advantages of this Practice Change:

Disadvantages of this Practice Change:

Will you be using this practice in the future:

% of farm you would be confident to use this practice :