









# **Catalyst Project Report**

Grower Information				
Grower Name:	John and Helen Pastega			
Entity Name:	PASTEGA JP & MRS H ATF J & H PASTEGA FAMILY TRUST			
Trial Farm No/Name:	МКҮ-03092А			
Mill Area:	Mackay Sugar - Marian			
Total Farm Area ha:	700			
No. Years Farming:	45 – 2 generations on farm			
Trial Subdistrict:	Eton			
Area under Cane ha:	540			











# **Background Information**

#### Aim:

To lower the amount of imidacloprid applied per hectare by using variable rate technology, whilst maintaining adequate grub control.

#### Background:

In lighter soils grubs tend to be more prevalent so a higher rate of product to control numbers is required, compared to heavier soils. In paddocks with various soil types, generally a set rate would be applied to the whole paddock. This results in some areas receiving not enough product, while other areas receive excess.

Variable rate technology is being applied to the application of fertiliser and herbicides, and this trial will investigate the variable rate application of grub control. By better targeting application rates to soil type, grub control will be maintained, and excess applications will be avoided.

**Potential Water Quality Benefit:** Decrease imidacloprid in run off

Expected Outcome of Trial:

Adequate grub control across the paddock

Service provider contact: Farmacist

Where did this idea come from: Farmacist /Grower











<u>Plan -</u> <u>Project</u> <u>Activities</u>	Date: (mth/year to be undertaken)	Activities :(breakdown of each activity for each stage)					
Stage 1	April 2017	Set up equipment and develop VR map					
Stage 2	August 2017	Plant cane and apply VR Suscon					
Stage 3	November 2017	Install KP samplers					
Stage 4	March-May 2018	Grub counts and agronomic assessment					
Stage 5	July 2018	Harvest production					
Stage 6	March-May 2019	Grub counts and agronomic assessment					
Stage 7	October 2019	Harvest trial					











# **Project Trial site details**

Trial Crop:	Sugar Cane
Variety:	Mixed
Rat/Plt:	
Trial Block	3092A block 03-01
No/Name:	
Trial Block Size Ha:	9.79
<b>Trial Block Position</b>	148.9592048, -21.2617426
(GPS):	
Soil Type:	Mixed











#### **Block History, Trial Design:**



Figure 1 Trial layout in relation to EC map of the trial paddock. Rows run from East to West

As shown in Figure 1, the paddock had a number of different soil zones, therefore treatments were placed to capture the different zones.

#### **Treatments:**

- 1. Suscon Maxi applied at 15kg/ha (225g / 100m row)
- 2. Suscon Maxi applied at 10kg/ha (150g / 100m row)











### **Results:**

Grub counts conducted during April 2018 indicated no greyback grubs present at the site in either treatment (Figure 2).

Pastega Susc	on Trial - G	irub Count	S					
Date	18.04.18							T1 = 15kg
								T2=10kg
Repetition	Treatment	Stool No.	No. Grubs	Repetition	Treatment	Stool No.	No. Grubs	
1	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	
		2	1			2	0	
		3	1			3	0	
		4	0			4	0	
2	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	
		2	0			2	0	
		3	0			3	0	
		4	0			4	0	
3	1	1	0	3	2	1	0	
		2	0			2	0	
		3	0			3	0	
		4	0			4	0	

Figure 2 - Grub count at Pastega suscon trial site (Grub were identified as Christmas beetle and not greyback)

#### 2018 Harvest

As seen in the graphs below (Figures 3 and 4), the treatments where Suscon was applied at 15kg/ha yielded slightly higher than the 10kg/ha treatment in both tonnes of cane and tonnes of sugar per hectare. Grub counts will be conducted again in April 2019 to assess whether this yield difference can be attributed to grub presence. Yield will also be reassessed at harvest in 2019.

















Figure 4 - Sugar yield at 2018 harvest

#### **Grub Counts 2019**

Grub counts were conducted across the paddock for all treatments and no cane grubs were present.











## **Conclusions and comments**

In the early stages of this trial, no grubs were found in either treatment, indicating that the lower Suscon rate was adequate to reduce or eliminate grub pressure within the first year of application. The site will continue to be monitored to assess the differences in longevity of the product at the different rates.

Advantages of this Practice Change: Reduced application of chemical that is found in waterways

**Disadvantages of this Practice Change:** Risk of increased grub pressure

Will you be using this practice in the future:

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

Site is continuing 2019