

# **Project LIE 00008**

**Working together to deliver multiple benefit  
messages to growers through a whole systems  
approach to soil management**

**Prepared by  
Stephen Carr  
Aglime of Australia  
June 2016**

# Introduction

Soil acidity has long been recognized as a serious limitation to agricultural production in Western Australia. As a consequence, there has been considerable investment from both the government and private sector in establishing lime trials and demonstrations to show the value of managing soil acidity appropriately.

The Department of Agriculture and Food WA has been a key player in establishing many trials that have been aimed to service both field based research and subsequent extension opportunities. Unlike other agronomic trials, lime trials remain valuable (if relocatable) for many years post their establishment phase.

Obtaining the best extension value from lime trials is always a challenge compared to other field based agronomy. The reasons are complex, but some key issues are:

- The time lag, some trials can take several years to respond and/or 'become visual' can complicate 'extension' opportunities
- Establishment of many lime trials happened when grower interest was far less than it is today, hence there may have been a lack of 'receptiveness' to view and absorb information, and this has now changed
- Tenure of funding and focus on lime is not always aligned optimally, hence valuable lime trials are 'abandoned' before they become important and suitable to promote to growers
- Suboptimal rates of lime initially applied to 'ameliorate' acidity adequately, for example when surface acidity is resolved, but subsoil acidity is still limiting.

Ongoing extension of the importance of lime in farming systems is now more topical for farmers and the diversity of industry people that growers work with. GRDC has supported a new approach to enhance extension opportunities- by 'reusing' some old lime trials.

Since this project commenced, Aglime has successfully located many old lime trials across south west of WA. Many have been soil sampled; others will be sampled during the next sampling season.

# Forward

With the widespread recognition of extent and severity of soil acidity as a limitation to agriculture in WA, there have been many projects involved in the establishment and subsequent monitoring of the trials and demonstrations of using lime. One of the key extension tools used in the mid 1990's was the establishment of large scale (farmer equipment) demonstration sites to provide a valuable resource for research and serve as a reference point to assess the benefits of liming across WA. Many of these early trials are being relocated, soil sampled, and used for extension purposes now - which is testament to the foresight of those involved in establishing them.

Many people contributed to the establishment and conduct of lime field trials and demonstrations, particularly the Western Australian Soil Acidity Research and Demonstration team:

- Chris Gazey
- Amanda Miller
- Dave Gartner
- Sandy Pate
- Geoff Anderson

Other DAFWA staff also assisted with the process:

- Mike Bolland
- Nancye Gannaway
- Vicki Bolt
- Dan Hester
- Jason Brady
- Andrea Hills
- Jasmine Cheetham
- Colin Holt
- Adrian Cox
- Meg Howe
- Tony Clark
- Kylie Jensen
- Jenny Crisp
- Brendan McAuliffe
- Don Cummings
- Darren Morris
- Eliza Dowling
- Graham Mussell
- Amanda Just
- Tim Wiley

For early data relating to some the trials reported in this document, the reader is directed to:

**Penny, S. and Gazey, G (2002)** Western Australia Soil Acidity. Demonstration Site Results 1996-2001.  
Department of Agriculture **Misc Publication 24/2001. ISSN 1326-4168**

## Acknowledgements

The 'Time to Lime' project was a major coordinated research and extension initiative during which time, many of the trials reported upon were initiated, and many organisations contributed:

- Grains Research and Development Corporation
- Department of Agriculture, Government of Western Australia
- National Landcare Program
- Land and Water Resources Research and Development Corporation
- National Heritage Trust
- CSIRO Australia
- Centre for Legumes in Mediterranean Agriculture
- The University of Western Australia
- Australia Fertiliser Services Association

I acknowledge GRDC project LIE00008, "Working together to deliver multiple benefit messages to growers through a whole systems approach to soil management" for financial support, and the staff at Liebe Group Inc for their management support.

Special thanks to Chris Gazey (Senior Research Officer, DAFWA Northam) and David Gartner for the detailed records kept from the trial establishment phase, and their subsequent assistance in locating this series of field trials.

## Methodology

Aglime of Australia has been engaged as the sub-contractor involved in relocating, and resampling these old lime trials. The data reported, and the individual comments made on each trial are delivered in good faith, but should not necessarily be used in isolation in delivering widespread extension messages.

This document contains the five trial reports, and represents the summary of data collected during the project and has been reported against the initial treatments as described by DAFWA (the trial initiator). In some cases, there have been subsequent treatments (ie additional lime) applied to the original trial design. DAFWA is still looking at the full array of additional treatments (for example, combinations of additional lime and tillage options). All pH measurements reported in this document have been measured in the standard 1:5 soil: 0.01M CaCl<sub>2</sub>.

For simplicity only the initial lime treatments and if any subsequent lime has been applied are reported at this juncture.

It is extremely important to clarify that none of the trials reported on, have been under 'scientific management' for many years. Typically the trials reported upon were established, and under a regime of careful management and monitoring typically associated with DAFWA field based research for various times frames (typically for between 3 and 8 years). Since that time, they have all simply remained 'as a zone treated as the rest of the paddock 'within the normal farm management regime imposed by the cooperating farmer. In some cases, farms have been sold. Despite concerted attempts, complete understanding of any additional inputs imposed on the trials sites is not known.

## Disclaimer

Aglime of Australia, neither DAFWA nor the cooperating farmer has full documentation of all inputs on these sites over that time frame since their establishment. On this basis therefore utmost care must be taken in drawing any isolated conclusions from the data. For instance additional lime, or fertilizer or herbicides could have been dumped on sections of the trial, and this could have influenced soil condition as reported in this document.

Aglime of Australia strongly emphasizes this is preliminary data, and in effect represents 'a photograph in time' in relation to the longevity of time elapsed since the establishment of these field experiments. This is very important, considering the large time lapse involved since trials were established and managed as per the requirements of the researcher involved. In some experiments, known additional treatments have been imposed, albeit typically 2 to 10 years post the initial establishment. Drawing conclusions from either the initial or subsequent treatment applied, and direct attribution of any differences today must be carefully considered.

Aglime of Australia strongly advocates contacting Chris Gazey (Senior Research Officer at DAFWA) Email: [chris.gazey@agric.wa.gov.au](mailto:chris.gazey@agric.wa.gov.au) Mobile 0429 107 976 prior to making any statements about any of the preliminary data reported in this document.

# 94M058 –Chris Vanzetti (now Lawson Grain) Moora

---

## Key Messages

- A unique trial design (double up of each plot) was designed to allow destructive biomass sampling, and grain yield measurement
- This trial site was primarily used in a 'screening function'- to evaluate any negative impact of lime of a variety of different legumes which was considered to be happening during the mid 1990's. The key concern was to investigate if manganese deficiency was induced by liming
- The trial was sown to lupins in 1994, wheat in 1995. Data not available
- Yield responses (negative) were apparently not noted in the early years following establishment of the trial. Positive yield response did occur, several years post trial establishment
- The double up design allowed comparison of lime sources on many different species. For example, in 1996, narrow leaf and yellow lupins were compared. No data available
- In 1997 the trial was sown to wheat, no yield responses reported
- In 1998, the trial was sown to a diverse mix of new pasture legumes that were at various stages of evaluation prior to commercial release. Some of the material screened, that subsequently was commercialised included Cadiz French serradella, Santorini and Charano yellow serradella, Casbah Biserrula, Prima gland clover and finally Bartolo bladder clover. The primary focus of this work was to assess any negative impacts of lime on legumes. No negative impacts reported.
- The inclusion of this trial into this sampling regime, was primarily because of the known (high rates) of lime subsequently applied by the cooperating farmer, and the focus to see if these high rates had changed soil pH deeper in the profile, which did not occur initially

## Aim

The key aim of this trial was to compare soil pH change to depth; with two different sources of lime (lime sand and farmers chalk lime)

## Background

This trial was established in 1994, and involved 2 lime sources, limesand and a local farmers source of lime, and known locally as chalk lime. Details of the neutralising value and particle size distribution are unknown. Treatments were 0, 1, 2 and 4t/ha of limesand, and 1, 2 and 4t/ha of the farmers lime source. The soil type was deep yellow sandplain, with an initial soil pH of 4.6 over 4.2.

## Trial Details

---

<b>Property:</b>	Previous Chris Vanzetti, current Lawson Grain, Moora
<b>Plot size &amp; replication:</b>	1.44m wide, 30 m long, area per plot 0.0.0043 ha. 8 treatments by 4 replicates
<b>Soil type:</b>	Deep yellow sandplain
<b>Soil pH (CaCl<sub>2</sub>):</b>	Initially 4.6 (0-10cm) over 4.2 (10-20cm)

---

## Subsequent lime application across the trial

A total of 6t/ha of limesand was applied across the trial site post 1994 (year of trial establishment) to 2013 (when the property was sold to Lawson Grain). At the time of writing, we have not been able to determine if there has been subsequent lime application since 2013.

**1994 Soil pH in October 1994 (6 month post liming) with different rates of lime sand and farmers chalk lime**

Lime sand t/ha	0-10 cm	10-20 cm	20-30 cm
0	4.7	4.4	4.3
1	5.4	4.3	4.3
2	5.3	4.3	4.4
4	5.7	4.4	4.4
Farmers lime t/ha			
1	5.4	4.3	4.3
2	5.2	4.3	4.4
4	6.0	4.4	4.3

There was rapid change in the surface soil pH within 6 months of lime application; however the subsurface pH was not changed with lime application.

**2016 Soil pH with different rates of lime sand and farmers chalk lime applied 22 years previously**

Lime sand t/ha	0-10 cm	10-20 cm	20-30 cm
0	6.1	4.7	4.4
1	6.1	5.2	4.7
2	6.3	4.9	4.6
4	6.3	5.2	4.6
Farmers lime t/ha			
1	6.3	4.7	4.2
2	6.2	5.1	4.7
4	6.3	5.0	4.6
Sig	NS	NS	NS
Isd	0.30	0.62	0.40

**Comments**

There are no significant differences in soil pH at the surface, 10-20cm, and 20-30cm depths at this trial site (Figure 7a, b).

We view this outcome as extremely positive. The cooperating farmers saw the positive impact of lime on yields, despite this site really initially being set up to observe negative impact of lime. On this basis, he applied at least 6t/ha during the following 10 to 12 years.


The lack of any significant difference was expected, given the high rates of lime that have been applied across the trial site. Despite the lack of significant differences, there are trends at depth that basically reflect better soil pH profiles with higher amounts of the initial lime application. The source of lime (limesand or farmers chalk lime) has also had no impact on current soil pH. Clearly, the large rates subsequently applied would appear to have masked any initial differences.

Interestingly, despite high rates of lime across this trial site, and the fact 22 years have passed since the trial was established, there is still a relatively large pH gradient down the soil profile. Whilst the surface and 10-20cm layers are generally above the DAFWA suggested targets (5.5 over 4.8), some of the subsurface (20-30cm) soil pH are still marginal, and in fact below target. Given the high rainfall in this trial location, and the high productivity of this soil type, this is not all that surprising.


Even with high rates of lime applied; countering the acidification at depth on this soil type (especially given the frequency of lupins in the rotation which are renowned for contributing to subsoil acidification) is still a challenge for farmers.

The pH gradient on this trial site (ie good surface pH, getting worse at depth) yet again provides good evidence of the need to combine lime application with occasional deep and targeted tillage regimes, to ensure alkalinity from the surface soils is moved to be in contact with the more acidic subsoils. The success of high rates of lime alone, and many years of 'waiting' (without tillage) appear to be limited in managing subsoil acidity on soil types like this. This is especially relevant where initial soil pH profiles are low.

**Figure 7a. 2016 Soil pH with different rates of lime and applied 22 years previously**



**Figure 7b: 2016 Soil pH with different rates of farmers chalk lime applied 22 years previously**



**Paper reviewed by:**

Chris Gazey  
Senior Research Officer  
Department of Agriculture and Food WA  
NORTHAM WA 6401

## APPENDIX

GRDC has funded this cooperative program involving Liebe, MIG, WMG and South DIRT group and Aglime of Australia to have soil acidity better managed across the state. Given the project title "Working together to deliver multiple benefit messages to growers through a whole systems approach to soil management", raising awareness about the importance of understanding soil acidity, and its limitations to profitable agriculture is a critical focus of all project partners.

To achieve this regime, in addition to sampling the 'old long term lime trials', Aglime has been instrumental in trying to encourage growers to recognize the importance of actually making soil pH measurements in their own trial and demonstration programs.

In addition to the soil sampling milestone requirements, Aglime has focused on ways to enhance growers, and the various staff from many organizations they are working with to gain a better understanding of the variation in soil type, and the importance of adequate pH measurement, before and post the application of various lime and tillage treatments.

A key focus of this approach has been to establish dialogue, and create 'small nodes' of activity related to trialing and demonstrating using lime to treat acidity across the WA wheatbelt. The rationale is to help growers understand the issues, and ultimately to help growers to help themselves.

One approach taken to achieve this objective has been to offer comprehensive soil sampling to growers involved in establishing and monitoring their own field trials. During the first two years of this project, Aglime has sampled for various collaborators (data not shown in this report). All data has been returned to the various project staff, who will report direct to the organisations they receive funding from, and cooperate with in their various programs. Aglime does have copies of all this raw data and the geo locations of the collection sites, and it can be made available to GRDC upon request.

Some of the relevant examples across the WA wheatbelt include:

Brian Cusack- Narembeen  
Travis Hollins- Nungarin  
Dennis Martin- Badgingarra  
Will Browne- Warradargee  
Peter Negus- Dandaragan  
Murray Preston- Geraldton  
Tony Sasche- Bencubbin  
Ben Hobley- Nyabing  
Tony Murfit- South Burracoppin

We have tried to address this issue, albeit with a small number of growers in the state, and the 'end result' of considerable field sampling and literally hundreds of soil pH measurements from a single field trial is often only a simple graph, with small numbers of pH profiles reflecting various treatments over time.

Most growers and consultants understand the pH scale (logarithmic), and the fact a soil with a pH of 4.5 has ten times the acid concentration of a soil at pH 5.5. However, very few understand the impact of initial soil pH on the rate of lime reaction. Whilst the acid concentration is 10 fold for 1 pH unit, the rate of lime dissolution in the field is more typically 100 fold for a 1 pH unit change (i.e lime dissolves 100 times faster at pH 4.5 than it does at pH 5.5).

The implications of this chemical fact, in broadacre field trials looking at low (typically 1 or 2t/ha of lime) rates of lime is grossly underestimated, and inadequate interpretation of the effectiveness of lime in treating soil acidity is usual thereafter. If farmer trials are inadequately designed and replicated (and many are), and the starting pH of the plots nominally allocated as the control or nil lime plots simply by chance happens to be at

pH 4.8, and the starting pH of the plots receiving 2t/ha by chance start at pH 4.2, then a typical conclusion 12 months post lime trial establishment is that 'lime didn't work' in changing the soil pH.

If adequate numbers of soil cores and replications of the various treatments are made at the start of a lime trial, and again post treatment, then erroneous conclusions are less likely. However, like many issues, the time involved to collect enough soil samples, and the lack of willingness to part with the money required to make the appropriate number of pH measurements (CSBP lab in Perth charges \$14 per sample for a pH measurement) generally means a compromise is made. This needs to be understood.

Another issue with farmer established lime trials that does impact on results obtained is the fact growers are using a variety of lime sources, and often of unknown quality. The concept of a 'bargain' source of lime which maybe advertised at a lower price per tonne would seem to appeal to many, despite the fact its neutralising value may be vastly inferior to another source of lime available at a marginally higher listed price.

Added to the complication of neutralising value is the issue of particle size. In the drying climate WA wheatbelt farmers operate in, the importance of particle size of lime sources is grossly underestimated by far too many.

It is an unequivocal fact, finer particles react quickest. They do not react more, simply faster. If soil acidity is limiting productivity (and again the facts are clear this is the case), getting lime to react as fast as possible is imperative.

Even in the case of some of the work reported in this document when high NV lime, of a very fine particle size has been used, there is still clearly unreacted lime at depth 15 years post treatment. Whilst there can be no argument, tillage of certain soil types can have negative (as well as positive) outcomes, the evidence presented in the photographs is not uncommon across many WA lime trials. Inadequate mixing of lime and acid soils is common, and restricting access to the economic benefits correct amelioration offers.

Whilst lime use has clearly increased dramatically over the past ten years, the vast majority of lime applied across rural WA has simply been top-dressed on the surface. In many circumstances, surface acidity is not the culprit in limiting yields. If surface soils have been limed, and the current pH of this layer is improved (say from 4.5 up to 5.4), then any subsequent lime applied to the surface (without mechanical mixing) will have little impact on the soil pH in the deeper layers, which are still acid, and are still limiting access to water and nutrients at depth, and ultimately yield.

Farmers now better understand the need to use lime in managing acidity, however incorporation technology/process, the array of machinery options and the impact of the diversity of soil types across the state represent some considerable challenges that need far better resourcing.