Appendix A. Agronomic Data

The farmers who cooperated on this project conducted their trials to answer questions they had about transitioning to direct seeding. WSU Extension helped with design and data collection. We collected plant stand and weed count data from each trial, but these parameters are only presented where relevant. It is unlikely any differences in weed count were due to a species shift from direct seeding as only the Four Lakes trials were on the same site each year. In certain situations, weed differences may reflect the tillage treatments applied. The following tables show these variables and any statistical significance among treatments.

Table A1. The effect of stubble height on subsequent direct seeded winter and spring wheat crops at Latah, WA, from 2001 to 2003.

Treatment	Stand (plants/3 ft in 2 rows) 2001	Stand (plants/3 ft in 2 rows) 2002 δ	Stand (plants/3 ft in 2 rows) 2003	Yield (bu/A) 2001 - 2003	Adjusted return (\$/A) Ω 2001 - 2003
Tall stubble (20 inches)	52.7 а Ф	29.0 a	27.9 b	52.1 a	197.91 a
Short stubble (6 inches)	49.1 b	22.9 b	31.3 a	51.2 a	183.93 b

 $[\]Phi$ Treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level.

 $[\]delta$ Where the data is presented separately for each year, the treatment differences were not consistent from year to year.

 $[\]Omega$ Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a treatment less the cost of the residue management treatment only (no seeding, herbicide, fertilizer, harvest costs). We used total costs that included ownership, depreciation, fuel, maintenance, and wear and tear on the equipment. We used the costs for a mower, assuming the farmer would not use his combine for mowing a whole field. The costs for the treatments were: mowing - \$10.78/A, standing stubble - \$0/A. The grain price (\$3.80/bu) was the target price for 2001 to 2003.

Table A2. Effect of fall residue management on subsequent direct seeded spring crops at Fairfield, WA, from 2001 to 2003.

Treatment	Stand (plants/3 ft single row)	Weed count/100 ft	Barley yield (lb/A) 2001 δ	Spring wheat yield (lb/A) 2002	Lentil yield (lb/A) 2003	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2001 Ω †	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2002 †	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2003 †	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2001 ‡	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2002 ‡	Adjusted return (\$/A) 2003 ‡
3 - Standing stubble	31.9 a	4.7 b	2086 b	3769 a	792 ab	98.96 ab	238.66 a	94.61 a	98.97 a	238.66 a	94.60 a
1 - Fall mow (6 in high)	31.8 a	4.4 b	2285 b	3673 ab	694 b	97.32 b	221.82 b	72.06 b	97.32 a	221.83 b	72.06 b
2 - Fall disk rip + spring harrow	32.2 a	8.6 a	2729 a	3566 b	866 a	116.33 a	213.55 b	91.14 a	112.29 a	209.51 b	87.10 a

Φ Treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level.

 $[\]delta$ Where the data is presented separately for each year, the treatment differences were not consistent from year to year.

 $[\]Omega$ Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a treatment less the cost of the residue management treatment only (no seeding, herbicide, fertilizer, harvest costs). We used total costs that included ownership, depreciation, fuel, maintenance, and wear and tear on the equipment. The costs for the treatments were: mowing - \$10.78/A, harrow - \$2.25/A, disk rip - \$10/A (grower estimate) and \$14.04/A (WSU estimate), standing stubble - \$0. Grain prices were: wheat (target price) - \$3.80/bu, barley (target price) - \$2.21/bu, lentils (loan rate) - \$11.94/cwt.

[†]Disk ripper cost (grower estimate) - \$10/A.

[‡] Disk ripper cost (WSU estimate) - \$14.04/A.

Table A3. Effect of different levels of fall-applied nitrogen on Waldern spring oats direct seeded into Kentucky bluegrass residue at Valleyford, WA, from 2001 to 2003.

Treatment	Stand (plants/3 ft single row)	Test weight (lb)	Yield (lb/A)	Adjusted return (\$/A) Ω
50 lb fall N	34.6 а Ф	33.2 a	2929 a	108.24 a
100 lb fall N	33.0 a	32.3 a	3109 a	98.03 a
150 lb fall N	36.2 a	32.2 a	3057 a	79.06 b

 $[\]Phi$ Treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level.

 $[\]Omega$ Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a fertilizer treatment less the cost of the treatment only (no application, seeding, herbicide, harvest costs). The costs for the treatments included all elements applied (dry 29.5-5-0-3.5), but did not include application costs, which were the same across treatments. Treatment costs were: 50 lb/A N - \$16.67, 100 lb/A N - \$33.33, 150 lb/A N - \$50.00, and starter fertilizer - \$14/A. We used the target grain prices for oats of \$1.40 per 32-lb bushel. However, this price does not accurately reflect market value of the crop which was not marketable below 36 lb/bu.

Table A4. Effect of Biocat and disking (presented separately) as residue management tools on subsequent winter and spring wheat and barley at Four Lakes, WA, from 2001 to 2002.

Treatment	Fall	Spring	Spring	Spring	Stand	Test	Test	Test	Yield	Yield	Yield	Adjusted	Adjusted	Adjusted
	Residue	Residue	Residue	Residue			weight		(lb/A)	(lb/A)	(lb/A)	return	return	return
	(lb/A)	(lb/A)	(lb/A)	(lb/A)	of 2 rows)		(lb)	(lb)	2001 -	2001	2002	(\$/A)	(\$/A)	(\$/A)
	2001 -	2001 -	2001 δ	2002	2001 -	- 2002	2001	2002	2002			2001 -	2001	2002
	2002	2002			2002							2002Ω		
Biocat	3203 а Ф	1602 a			39.1 a	56.3 a			2612 a			116.62 b		
No Biocat	2952 a	1741 a			38.9 a	56.3 a			2599 a			138.45 a		
Disk	2687 b		1547 a	336 b	38.7 a		56.8 a	55.2 b		2058 b	2826 a		99.06 b	134.72 b
No Disk	3468 a		1783 a	3022 a	39.3 a		57.3 a	56.2 a		2606 a	2931 a		128.42 a	147 95 a

 $[\]Phi$ Treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level. δ Where the data is presented separately for each year, the treatment differences were not consistent from year to year.

 $[\]Omega$ Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a treatment less the cost of the treatment only (no seeding, herbicide, fertilizer, harvest costs). Biocat costs do not include application costs. For disking we used total costs that included ownership, depreciation, fuel, maintenance, and wear and tear on the equipment. The costs for the treatments were: Biocat - \$18.00/A for 35 oz rate, Biocat application - \$4.50/A, disking - \$6.63/A, control - \$0. Grain prices were: wheat (target price) - \$3.80/bu, barley (target price) - \$2.21/bu.

Table A5. Effect of Biocat (plus Seedburst, Greenburst, and Colorburst) and disking (presented separately) as residue management and growth enhancement tools on subsequent hard white winter (Nu Horizon) and spring wheat (377S) at Four Lakes, WA, in 2003.

Treatment	Fall	Spring	Stand	Weeds	Test	Yield	Adjusted
	Residue	Residue	(plants/3	(count/100	weight	(lb/A)	return
	(lb/A)	(lb/A)	ft of 2	ft)	(lb)		(\$/A) Ω
	2001 -		rows)				
	2002		2001 -				
			2002				
Biocat + Seedburst +	1677 а Ф	1003 a	41.2 a	20 a	62.2 a	2885 a	141.42 b
Greenburst +							
Colorburst							
No Biocat	1535 a	1003 a	41.1 a	18 a	62.1 a	2631 b	163.33 a
Disk	1584 a	698 b	41.6 a	17 a	62.1 b	2919 a	159.22 a
No Disk	1628 a	1309 a	40.7 a	21 a	62.3 a	2598 b	145.53 a
Biocat + Colorburst	2030 a	946 a	36.1 a	19 a	59.4 a	4337 a	246.15 b
Control	2159 a	980 a	35.6 a	18.4 a	59.6 a	4332 a	274 40 a
	•		•				

 Φ Paired treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level.

Ω Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a treatment less the cost of the treatment only (no seeding, herbicide, fertilizer, harvest costs). For disking we used total costs that included ownership, depreciation, fuel, maintenance, and wear and tear on the equipment. The costs for the treatments were: Biocat - \$18.00/A for 35 oz/A rate, Biocat application - \$4.50/A, Seedburst - \$3.30 for 2 oz/100 lb seed, Greenburst - \$6/A for 10 oz/A, Colorburst - \$6/A for 8 oz/A, disking - \$6.63/A, control - \$0. Grain prices were: wheat (target price) - \$3.80/bu. Seedburst, Greenburst, and Colorburst were applied as part of other management practices, so did not have an application cost.

Table A6. Effect of using a rotary subsoiler to increase soil water infiltration and yield in direct seeded winter wheat (Quantum Hybrid 7817) at Deep Creek, WA, from 2001 to 2003.

Treatment	Stand (plants/3	Yield	Adjusted	Adjusted
	ft single row)	(bu/A)	return (\$/A)	return (\$/A) ‡
			Ω \dagger	
No subsoiler	21 а Ф	61.6 a	233.96 a	233.97 a
Subsoiler	20 b	58.5 a	217.3 a	211.73 b

Φ Treatment means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different at the 5% probability level.

 $[\]Omega$ Adjusted return was the gross economic return on a treatment less the cost of the management treatment only (no seeding, herbicide, fertilizer, harvest costs). We used total costs that included ownership, depreciation, fuel, maintenance, and wear and tear on the equipment. The costs for the treatments were: No subsoiler - \$0/A, Subsoiler (grower estimate) - \$5/A, Subsoiler (WSU estimate) - \$10.57/A. Grain price was: Wheat (target price) - \$3.80/bu.

[†] Subsoiler cost (grower estimate) - \$5/A.

[‡] Subsoiler cost (WSU estimate) - \$10.57/A.