

**VARIABILITY IN CWRS WHEAT YIELD RESPONSE TO APPLIED
NITROGEN IN MANITOBA SOIL LANDSCAPES**

BY

LAURENT (Larry) DAVID JOSEPH DURAND

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Soil Science
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba

©March, 2002



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-76931-3

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

**Variability in CWRS Wheat Yield Response to Applied Nitrogen
in Manitoba Soil Landscapes**

BY

Laurent (Larry) David Joseph Durand

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of**

MASTER OF SCIENCE

LAURENT (LARRY) DAVID JOSEPH DURAND ©2002

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to University Microfilm Inc. to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ABSTRACT

Durand, Laurent David Joseph. M.Sc., The University of Manitoba, March, 2002.
Variability in CWRS Wheat Yield Response to Applied Nitrogen in Manitoba Soil Landscapes. Major Professor; Lesley G. Fuller.

Increasing economical and environmental pressures has sparked a great deal of interest in precision agriculture. Thus, a great deal of research has been initiated in order to gain a greater understanding of how existing technologies such as global positioning systems, geographic information systems, and equipment with variable rate capabilities can be used to manage agricultural amendments at a site specific level.

In 1996 and 1997, small plot trials were established at six sites in Southern Manitoba. Four of these sites were located on glacial till landscapes of the Newdale Association and the other two were located on lacustrine landscapes of the Red River Association. A variety of soil and crop parameters were examined throughout the study. Replicated small plots with fertilizer N rates ranging from 0 to 200 kg N ha⁻¹ were established in various positions in the landscape based on relative elevation, slope morphology, and slope aspect. The objective of the study was to determine if there were any significant differences in yield response to applied N in Canada Western Red Spring wheat in these landscapes.

In the glacial till landscapes, a number of the soil parameters were found to be strongly associated with landscape position. Among these parameters, electrical conductivity, depth of A horizon, solum depth, NO₃⁻-N, volumetric water content, and growing season N uptake tended to demonstrate the most consistent differences among landscape positions. However, yield and grain protein responses to applied nitrogen were extremely inconsistent throughout the study in these landscapes.

The soil parameters studied in the lacustrine landscapes demonstrated very different trends than those observed at the glacial till landscapes. Significant differences of the various soil properties studied were seldomly observed among landscape positions at these sites. However, the yield potential and yield response data was much more consistent and predictable.

The use of landscape position as the only variable in determining differences in yield responses to applied N proved to be ineffective in the glacial till landscapes studied. In these landscapes, more comprehensive models with various other soil parameters may need to be developed in order to make variable rate nitrogen decisions. However, the use of landscape positions to make variable rate nitrogen decisions in lacustrine landscapes may be more promising.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The successful completion of this thesis could not have been accomplished without the assistance of many dedicated individuals. I would like to take this opportunity to thank some of these people.

A number of summer assistants and part-time staff contributed a great deal of time and effort into this project. A special thanks to Teresa Visser, Phil Lariviere, Natasha Slobodian, and Laura Smith for their efforts. I would particularly like to thank Mr. Paul Martin. Your long hours, high quality of work, and friendship will never be forgotten.

I would also like to thank my fellow Graduate Students in the Department of Soil Science. Particularly, Andrea Bullinger, Derek Ebner, Jim Hicks, Grant Manning, Rob Maurice, Mitch Timmerman, and Brian Wiebe for your assistance in the field, the laboratory, at the computers, and for your friendship. You all made my stay at the Department of Soil Science a great learning experience.

For their assistance as resource people and site classification I would like to thank Bob Eilers, Elie St. Jacques, and Don Swindinsky of Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada's Land Resource Unit.

The support of all the staff of the Department of Soil Science also contributed greatly to this project. From the always cheery and helpful administration staff (Helen Nemeth and Pearl Novotny), to Greg Morden's support and patience in the laboratory, to all the academic staff who were always very inviting whenever I needed some advice or information a big thank you.

A special thanks to my advisory committee, Dr. Martin Entz, Dr. Don Flaten, and Dr. Geza Racz for their input, time, advice, and encouragement throughout this project.

A simple thank you seems inadequate when considering the support received from my advisor Dr. Les Fuller. This project could never have been completed without your knowledge, encouragement, patience, and friendship. For this support I will be forever grateful.

This study would not have been possible without the financial support of the following groups: Canada-Manitoba Agreement on Agricultural Sustainability (CMAAS), Canadian Wheat Board, Cargill Ltd., Potash and Phosphate Institute, Western Co-operative Fertilizers Ltd.

Finally, I would like to thank the support of all of my friends and family. I would particularly like to thank Mom and Dad for their encouragement throughout my education and my wife Patricia and daughter Claire for the inspiration they provide me every day.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
LIST OF FIGURES	xix
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xxi
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1. Nitrogen	3
2.2. Soil Water	5
2.2.1 Water and Nitrogen Relationships	5
2.3 Protein in Wheat Production	8
2.3.1 Factors Influencing Protein Content	9
2.3.1.1 Genotypic influences	9
2.3.1.2 Environmental and management influences	9
2.4 Precision Agriculture	13
2.4.1 Spatial Variability	14
2.4.1.1 Systematic variability and the soil-landscape	14
2.4.1.2 Landscape-based variability in soil moisture	15
2.4.1.3 Landscape-based variability in nitrogen and nitrogen indices	16
2.4.2 Approaches to Variable Rate Fertilization	20
2.4.2.1 Grid soil sampling procedures	20
2.4.2.2 Management units based on the soil-landscape	22
2.4.2.3 Other approaches to variable rate fertilization	23
2.4.2.4 Variability in yield responses to applied nutrients	25
2.5 Summary and Hypotheses	25
3. MATERIALS AND METHODS	27
3.1 Site Selection, Maintenance, and Handling	27
3.1.1 Newdale Till Plain Landscapes	27
3.1.1.1 Forrest 1996	30
3.1.1.2 Zero Tillage Farm 1996	32
3.1.1.3 Forrest 1997	33
3.1.1.4 Minnedosa	35
3.1.2 Red River Lacustrine Landscapes	37
3.1.2.1 Dufresne 1997	37
3.1.2.2 Elm Creek 1997	39
3.2 Soil and Site Descriptions	41
3.3 Laboratory Procedures	41
3.3.1 Soil Analyses	41

3.3.2	Plant Analyses	43
3.4	Statistical Analyses	44
3.4.1	Soil Property Comparisons	44
3.4.2	Nitrogen Response Curves	44
3.4.3	Yield Response to Applied Nitrogen Comparisons	45
3.4.4	Protein Response Curves and Protein Comparisons	51
4.	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	53
4.1	Newdale Till Plain Landscapes	53
4.1.1	Forrest 1996	53
4.1.1.1	Catena descriptions	53
4.1.1.2	Comparisons of soil properties	54
4.1.1.3	Soil water	59
4.1.1.4	Wheat yield	59
4.1.2	Zero Tillage Farm 1996	63
4.1.2.1	Catena descriptions	63
4.1.2.2	Comparisons of soil properties	64
4.1.2.3	Soil water	66
4.1.2.4	Nitrogen uptake	68
4.1.2.5	Wheat yield	70
4.1.2.6	Grain protein	77
4.1.3	Forrest 1997	79
4.1.3.1	Catena descriptions	79
4.1.3.2	Comparisons of soil properties	79
4.1.3.3	Soil water	83
4.1.3.4	Nitrogen uptake	83
4.1.3.5	Wheat yield	85
4.1.3.6	Grain protein	90
4.1.4	Minnedosa 1997	92
4.1.4.1	Catena descriptions	92
4.1.4.2	Comparisons of soil properties	93
4.1.4.3	Soil water	98
4.1.4.4	Nitrogen uptake	99
4.1.4.5	Wheat yield	100
4.1.4.6	Grain protein	106
4.2	Lacustrine Landscapes of the Red River Valley	107
4.2.1	Dufresne 1997	107
4.2.1.1	Description of landscapes studied	107
4.2.1.2	Comparisons of soil properties	108
4.2.1.3	Soil water	110
4.2.1.4	Nitrogen uptake	112
4.2.1.5	Wheat yield	112
4.2.1.6	Grain protein	116
4.2.2	Elm Creek 1997	117
4.2.1.1	Description of landscapes studied	117
4.2.1.2	Comparisons of soil properties	118
4.2.1.3	Soil water	120

4.2.1.4	Nitrogen uptake	122
4.2.1.5	Wheat yield	123
4.2.1.6	Grain protein	127
5.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	129
5.1	Newdale Till Plain Landscapes	129
5.2	Lacustrine Landscapes of the Red River Valley	133
5.3	Newdale Glacial Till Plain versus Red River Lacustrine Landscapes	135
6.	CONTRIBUTIONS TO KNOWLEDGE	136
7.	REFERENCES	138
8.	APPENDICES	146
A.	Profile and Slope Descriptions of Slope Positions Studied	146
B.	Relative Elevation, Spring Nutrient Distributions, and Nitrogen Mineralization Estimate Data	165
C.	Soil Volumetric Water Content Data	171
D.	Grain Yield and Grain Protein Content Data	177

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
3.1	Description of landscapes studied in Newdale glacial till plain.	28
3.2	Description of the lacustrine landscapes studied in the Red River Association.	29
3.3	Analysis of variance for quadratic model run through combined toeslope and midslope grain yield data of the Forrest 1997 site.	46
3.4	Analysis of variance for quadratic model with indicator variables run through combined toeslope and midslope grain yield data of the Forrest 1997 site.	46
3.5	Analysis of variance for linear model with indicator variables run through combined toeslope and midslope protein content data of the Forrest 1997 site.	52
4.1	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Forrest 1996 catenas.	55
4.2	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 80 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1996 catenas.	58
4.3	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1996 catenas.	60
4.4	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1996 catenas.	60
4.5	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the midseason biomass yield nitrogen response curves.	61
4.6	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the midseason biomass yield nitrogen response curves.	61
4.7	Comparison among midseason biomass yields of the toeslope and the midslope at Forrest '96 site.	62
4.8	Comparison among midseason biomass yields of the toeslope and the shoulder position at Forrest '96 site.	62

4.9	Comparison among midseason biomass yields of the midslope and the shoulder position at Forrest '96 site.	62
4.10	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 catenas.	65
4.11	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 80 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 catenas.	67
4.12	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 catenas.	69
4.13	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 catenas.	69
4.14	Growing season nitrogen uptake by the crop in the 0, 80, and 200 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatments at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	69
4.15	Influence of slope position on increase in N uptake and N fertilizer uptake efficiency at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	69
4.16	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 nitrogen response curves.	71
4.17	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 nitrogen response curves.	71
4.18	Comparison among the yield indices of the Nonsaline toeslopes and the Saline toeslopes at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	73
4.19	Comparison among yield indices of the Nonsaline toeslopes and the Midslopes at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	73
4.20	Comparison among yield indices of the Nonsaline toeslopes and the Shoulders at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	74
4.21	Comparison among yield indices of the Saline toeslopes and the Midslopes at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	74
4.22	Comparison among yield indices of the Saline toeslopes and the Shoulders at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	74
4.23	Comparison among yield indices of the Midslopes and the Shoulders at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	75

4.24	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the protein response curves at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	78
4.25	Comparison among grain protein responses at the Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site.	78
4.26	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Forrest 1997 catenas.	80
4.27	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 90 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1997 catenas.	84
4.28	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1997 catenas.	84
4.29	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Forrest 1997 catenas.	84
4.30	Growing season nitrogen uptake by the crop in the 0, 90, and 200 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatments of the Forrest 1997 site.	84
4.31	Influence of slope position on increase in N uptake and N fertilizer uptake efficiency at Forrest 1997 site.	85
4.32	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the Forrest 1997 nitrogen response curves.	86
4.33	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the Forrest 1997 nitrogen response curves.	86
4.34	Comparison among the yield indices of the Toeslopes and the Midslopes at the Forrest 1997 site.	87
4.35	Comparison among yield indices of the Toeslopes and the Shoulders at the Forrest 1997 site.	88
4.36	Comparison among yield indices of the Midslopes and the Shoulders at the Forrest 1997 site.	88
4.37	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the protein response curves at the Forrest 1997 site.	91
4.38	Comparisons among grain protein responses at the Forrest 1997 site.	92

4.39	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Minnedosa 1997 catenas.	94
4.40	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 90 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Minnedosa 1997 catenas.	97
4.41	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Minnedosa 1997 catenas.	99
4.42	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Minnedosa 1997 catenas.	99
4.43	Growing season nitrogen uptake by the crop in the 0, 90, and 200 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatments of the Minnedosa 1997 site.	100
4.44	Influence of slope position on increase in N uptake and N fertilizer uptake efficiency at Minnedosa 1997 site.	100
4.45	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the Minnedosa 1997 nitrogen response curves.	101
4.46	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the Minnedosa 1997 nitrogen response curves.	101
4.47	Comparison among the yield indices of the Toeslopes and the Upper midslopes at the Minnedosa 1997 site.	103
4.48	Comparison among yield indices of the Toeslopes and the Knolls at the Minnedosa 1997 site.	103
4.49	Comparison among yield indices of the Upper midslopes and the Knolls at the Minnedosa site.	104
4.50	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the protein response curves at the Minnedosa 1997 site.	106
4.51	Comparison among grain protein responses at the Minnedosa 1997 site.	107
4.52	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Dufresne 1997 site.	109
4.53	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 90 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Dufresne 1997 site.	111

4.54	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Dufresne 1997 site.	111
4.55	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Dufresne 1997 site.	111
4.56	Growing season nitrogen uptake by the crop in the 0, 90, and 200 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatments of the Dufresne 1997 site.	112
4.57	Influence of slope position on increase in N uptake and N fertilizer uptake efficiency at Dufresne 1997.	112
4.58	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the Dufresne 1997 nitrogen response curves.	113
4.59	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the Dufresne 1997 nitrogen response curves.	113
4.60	Comparison among the yield indices of the Microhigh and the Microlow positions at the Dufresne 1997 site.	114
4.61	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the protein response curves at the Dufresne 1997 site.	116
4.62	Comparison among grain protein responses at the Dufresne 1997 site.	116
4.63	Soil property comparisons among slope positions of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	119
4.64	Comparisons of soil temperature in the 90 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	121
4.65	Comparisons of volumetric water contents in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	121
4.66	Comparisons of water use in the 0 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatment among slope positions of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	121
4.67	Growing season nitrogen uptake by the crop in the 0, 90, and 200 kg N ha ⁻¹ treatments of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	122
4.68	Influence of slope position on increase in N uptake and N fertilizer uptake efficiency of the Elm Creek 1997 site.	122

4.69	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic model of the Elm Creek 1997 nitrogen response curves.	124
4.70	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the quadratic plus plateau model of the Elm Creek 1997 nitrogen response curves.	124
4.71	Comparison among the yield indices of the Microhigh and the Microlow positions at the Elm Creek 1997 site.	125
4.72	Comparison among yield indices of the Microhigh and the Low positions at the Elm Creek 1997 site.	125
4.73	Comparison among yield indices of the Microlow and the Low positions at the Elm Creek 1997 site.	125
4.74	Parameter estimates and p-values from the analyses of variance for the protein response curves at the Elm Creek 1997 site.	128
4.75	Comparison among grain protein responses at the Elm Creek 1997 site.	128

TABLES IN APPENDICES

Table		Page
A.1	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 1, Forrest 1996.	146
A.2	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 2, Forrest 1996.	146
A.3	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 3, Forrest 1996.	146
A.4	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 4, Forrest 1996.	146
A.5	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 1, Forrest 1996.	147
A.6	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 2, Forrest 1996.	147
A.7	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 3, Forrest 1996.	147
A.8	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 4, Forrest 1996.	147
A.9	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 1, Forrest 1996.	148
A.10	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 2, Forrest 1996.	148
A.11	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 3, Forrest 1996.	148
A.12	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 4, Forrest 1996.	148
A.13	Profile and slope descriptions – Nonsaline Toeslope Rep. 1, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	149
A.14	Profile and slope descriptions – Nonsaline Toeslope Rep. 2, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	149
A.15	Profile and slope descriptions – Saline Toeslope Rep. 1, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	149
A.16	Profile and slope descriptions – Saline Toeslope Rep. 2, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	149
A.17	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 1, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	150
A.18	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 2, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	150

A.19	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 3, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	150
A.20	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 4, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	150
A.21	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 1, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	151
A.22	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 2, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	151
A.23	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 3, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	151
A.24	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 4, Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	151
A.25	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 1, Forrest 1997.	152
A.26	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 2, Forrest 1997.	152
A.27	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 3, Forrest 1997.	152
A.28	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 1, Forrest 1997.	152
A.29	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 2, Forrest 1997.	153
A.30	Profile and slope descriptions – Midslope Rep. 3, Forrest 1997.	153
A.31	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 1, Forrest 1997.	153
A.32	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 2, Forrest 1997.	153
A.33	Profile and slope descriptions – Shoulder Rep. 3, Forrest 1997.	154
A.34	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 1, Minnedosa 1997.	154
A.35	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 2, Minnedosa 1997.	154
A.36	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 3, Minnedosa 1997.	154
A.37	Profile and slope descriptions – Toeslope Rep. 4, Minnedosa 1997.	155
A.38	Profile and slope descriptions – Lower Midslope Rep. 1, Minnedosa 1997.	155

A.39	Profile and slope descriptions – Lower Midslope Rep. 2, Minnedosa 1997.	155
A.40	Profile and slope descriptions – Lower Midslope Rep. 3, Minnedosa 1997.	155
A.41	Profile and slope descriptions – Lower Midslope Rep. 4, Minnedosa 1997.	156
A.42	Profile and slope descriptions – Upper Midslope Rep. 1, Minnedosa 1997.	156
A.43	Profile and slope descriptions – Upper Midslope Rep. 2, Minnedosa 1997.	156
A.44	Profile and slope descriptions – Upper Midslope Rep. 3, Minnedosa 1997.	156
A.45	Profile and slope descriptions – Upper Midslope Rep. 4, Minnedosa 1997.	157
A.46	Profile and slope descriptions – Knoll Rep. 1, Minnedosa 1997.	157
A.47	Profile and slope descriptions – Knoll Rep. 2, Minnedosa 1997.	157
A.48	Profile and slope descriptions – Knoll Rep. 3, Minnedosa 1997.	157
A.49	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 1, Dufresne 1997.	158
A.50	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 2, Dufresne 1997.	158
A.51	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 3, Dufresne 1997.	158
A.52	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 4, Dufresne 1997.	158
A.53	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 5, Dufresne 1997.	159
A.54	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 6, Dufresne 1997.	159
A.55	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 1, Dufresne 1997.	159
A.56	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 2, Dufresne 1997.	159
A.57	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 3, Dufresne 1997.	160

A.58	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 4, Dufresne 1997.	160
A.59	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 5, Dufresne 1997.	160
A.60	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 6, Dufresne 1997.	160
A.61	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 1, Elm Creek 1997.	161
A.62	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 2, Elm Creek 1997.	161
A.63	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 3, Elm Creek 1997.	161
A.64	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 4, Elm Creek 1997.	161
A.65	Profile and slope descriptions – Microhigh Rep. 5, Elm Creek 1997.	162
A.66	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 1, Elm Creek 1997.	162
A.67	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 2, Elm Creek 1997.	162
A.68	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 3, Elm Creek 1997.	162
A.69	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 4, Elm Creek 1997.	163
A.70	Profile and slope descriptions – Microlow Rep. 5, Elm Creek 1997.	163
A.71	Profile and slope descriptions – Low Rep. 1, Elm Creek 1997.	163
A.72	Profile and slope descriptions – Low Rep. 2, Elm Creek 1997.	163
A.73	Profile and slope descriptions – Low Rep. 3, Elm Creek 1997.	164
A.74	Profile and slope descriptions – Low Rep. 4, Elm Creek 1997.	164
A.75	Profile and slope descriptions – Low Rep. 5, Elm Creek 1997.	164
B.1	Forrest 1996.	165
B.2	Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	166
B.3	Forrest 1997.	167
B.4	Minnedosa 1997.	168
B.5	Dufresne 1997	169

B.6	Elm Creek 1997.	170
C.1	Forrest 1996.	171
C.2	Zero Tillage Farm 1996.	172
C.3	Forrest 1997.	173
C.4	Minnedosa 1997.	174
C.5	Dufresne 1997	175
C.6	Elm Creek 1997.	176
D.1	Zero Tillage 1996 Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹).	177
D.2	Zero Tillage 1996 Grain Protein Content.	178
D.3	Forrest 1997 Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹).	179
D.4	Forrest 1997 Grain Protein Content.	179
D.5	Minnedosa 1997 Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹).	180
D.6	Minnedosa 1997 Grain Protein Content.	181
D.7	Dufresne 1997 Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹).	182
D.8	Dufresne 1997 Grain Protein Content.	183
D.9	Elm Creek 1997 Grain Yield (kg ha ⁻¹).	184
D.10	Elm Creek 1997 Grain Protein Content.	185

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
2.1	Ideal nitrogen responses for grain yield and protein (Selles et al. 1997).	10
3.1	Sample catena found at Forrest 1996 site illustrating the three landscape positions studied: Toeslope, Midslope, and Shoulder, as well as a sample N fertilizer treatment randomization (kg N ha ⁻¹).	31
3.2	Sample catena found at Zero-Till Research Farm site illustrating the four landscape positions studied: Nonsaline and Saline Toeslopes, Midslope, and Shoulder.	33
3.3	Sample catena found at Forrest 1997 site illustrating the three landscape positions studied: Toeslope, Midslope, and Shoulder.	35
3.4	Sample catena found at Minnedosa 1997 site illustrating the four landscape positions studied: Toeslope, Lower Midslope, Upper Midslope, and Knoll.	36
3.5	Topographic diagram of a portion of the Dufresne 1997 transects showing the two positions studied: Microhigh and Microlow.	38
3.6	Topographic diagram of portions of the Elm Creek 1997 transects showing the three positions studied: Microhigh, Microlow, and Low.	40
3.7	Diagrammatic representation indicating differences in quadratic response models under three different scenarios: a) models with differing intercept parameter estimates only; b) models with differing linear estimates only; and c) models with differing quadratic estimates only.	49
4.1	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Forrest 1996 site	62
4.2	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site	76
4.3	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at maturity – Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site	76
4.4	Quadratic model indicating grain yield at maturity – Zero Tillage Farm 1996 site	77
4.5	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Forrest 1997 site	89

4.6	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at maturity – Forrest 1997 site	89
4.7	Quadratic model indicating grain yield at maturity – Forrest 1997 site	90
4.8	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Minnedosa 1997 site	104
4.9	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at maturity – Minnedosa 1997 site	105
4.10	Quadratic model indicating grain yield at maturity – Minnedosa 1997 site	105
4.11	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Dufresne 1997 site	114
4.12	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at maturity – Dufresne 1997 site	115
4.13	Quadratic model indicating grain yield at maturity – Dufresne 1997 site	115
4.14	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at anthesis – Elm Creek 1997 site	126
4.15	Quadratic model indicating total aboveground biomass yield at maturity – Elm Creek 1997 site	126
4.16	Quadratic model indicating grain yield at maturity – Elm Creek 1997 site	127

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS
(in order of appearance in text)

- CWRS:** Canada Western Red Spring
- SCZ:** Soil Climatic Zone
- CWAD:** Canada Western Amber Durum
- NUE:** Nitrogen Use Efficiency
- Δ plant N/ Δ N fertilizer:** change in plant nitrogen content/change in nitrogen fertilizer applied
- UNR:** Unit Nitrogen Requirement
- VRF:** Variable Rate Fertilization
- CSSC:** Canadian System of Soil Classification
- GLR.BLC:** Gleyed Rego Black Chernozem
- O.BLC:** Orthic Black Chernozem
- CA.BLC:** Calcareous Black Chernozem
- R.BLC:** Rego Black Chernozem
- GL.BLC:** Gleyed Black Chernozem
- GLCU.HR:** Gleyed Cumulic Humic Regosol
- GL.HV:** Gleyed Humic Vertisol
- GLC.HV:** Gleysolic Humic Vertisol
- g ai:** grams of active ingredient
- vol.:** volumetric
- prec.:** precipitation
- E.C.:** Electrical Conductivity

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances and interest in variable rate fertilizer technology has sparked a great deal of research relating to within-field variability. In a number of instances, variability in soil properties has been reported to be intimately correlated to the soil-landscape (Brubaker et al. 1993, Hanna et al. 1982, Malo et al. 1974, Moore et al. 1993, Moulin et al. 1994, Pan and Hopkins 1991, Pennock and de Jong 1987, Pennock and de Jong 1990, Verity and Anderson 1990). Many of these properties are also known to significantly influence crop yield and quality factors. As such, researchers (Franzen et al. 1997, Beckie et al. 1997) have proposed a focus on landscaped-based approaches to variable rate fertilizer applications. Unfortunately, no single approach that is consistently agronomically and economically viable has yet been found.

Although it is recognized that systematic variability within the soil-landscape exists, there has been limited work done to determine how this variability affects crop response to fertilizer amendments. In most instances, variable rate fertilizer recommendations are made on the assumption that there is variability within the soil-landscape, but responses to applied fertilizer remain constant throughout the landscape.

In 1996 and 1997, a series of small plot trials were established in both the Newdale Glacial Till Plain and the Red River Lacustrine deposits of Southern Manitoba. The crop under investigation was Canada Western Red Spring (CWRS) wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). The objectives of the study were to:

- 1) Measure various soil properties and determine whether they were associated with landscape position.
- 2) Compare differences in CWRS wheat yield and grain protein response to applied nitrogen fertilizer among landscape positions.

The premise of this study is that if systematic differences in soil properties among landscape positions exist and these differences result in predictable differences in CWRS wheat yield and protein responses, more informed variable rate N fertilization decisions can be proposed for this crop.