

Elizabeth Rieke, Ph.D. Soil Microbiome Scientist





ASSESSING SOIL HEALTH AT SCALE AND INCORPORATING MEASURES OF THE MICROBIOME

SOIL HEALTH INSTITUTE SCIENCE TEAM





SOIL HEALTH:

The capacity of a soil to function as a vital, living ecosystem that sustains plants, animals, and humans.



Outline

• Choosing soil health indicators

• Interpreting soil health indicators

• Incorporating measures of the microbiome in soil health





NORTH AMERICAN PROJECT TO EVALUATE SOIL HEALTH MEASUREMENTS TEAM

Dr. Cristine Morgan
Dr. Kelsey Greub
Dr. Dianna Bagnall
Dr. Dan Liptzin
Dr. Michael Cope
Ms. Janeva Williams
Dr. Mac Bean
Dr. Paul Tracy
Dr. Charlotte Norris













GOAL: Identify most effective indicators of soil health **APPROACH:** Evaluate soil health indicators on long-term agricultural research sites

124 long term experimental sites

NAPESHM

Over 30 Measurements that indicate soil health





Measures of Soil Health

	CARBON	NITROGEN	WATER/STRUCTURE	COMMUNITY
	Soil Organic Carbon	Total N	Plant Available Water	16S Amplicon Sequencing
	Active Carbon(POXc)	Autoclaved Citrate Extractable Protein - ACE	Saturated Hydraulic Conductivity	ITS Amplicon Sequencing
	Potentially Mineralizable C (24 & 96 hr CO ₂ -C)	Potentially Mineralizable N - Anaerobic	Porosity/Bulk Density	Shotgun Function Metagenomics
	B-glucosidase	N-acetyl B-glucosamidase	Soil Stability Index	Phospholipid Fatty Acid - PLFA
	Water Extractable C	Water Extractable N	Aggregate Stability – Wet Sieve, SLAKES, Sprinkle Infiltrometer	Enzymes(C, N, P, S)
	Microbial Biomass C	H3A Extractable N		
INSTITUTE —				

Measurement Criteria

- Primarily indicate soil health
 - Not inherent properties
 - Not fertility measurements
- Responsive to soil health management practices
 - Reduced tillage
- Organic amendments
- Cover crops
- Residue retention
- Applicable for measurement at scale
 - Cost effective
 - Available commercially
- Non-redundant
 - Provide information on different ecosystem services





NAPESHM

Measurement Selection

- Soil organic carbon
 - Major component of soil organic matter
 - Measure using dry combustion
- 24-hr Potential carbon mineralization
 - "Respiration"
 - Microbial response to soil rewetting
 - Related to microbial biomass





NAPESHM

Measurement Selection

- Aggregate stability
 - Linked to reduced erosion, increased infiltration
 - Fraction of aggregates remaining after exposed to wetting and/or mechanical disturbances







Photos and video by Kade Flynn

NAPESHM

Measurement Selection

Soil Science Society of America Journal



PAPERS ON ORIGINAL RESEARCH | 🔂 Open Access

Carbon-sensitive pedotransfer functions for plant available water

Dianna Kathleen Bagnall 🔀, Cristine L.S. Morgan, Michael Cope, Gregory M. Bean, Shannon Cappellazzi, Kelsey Greub, Daniel Liptzin, Charlotte L. Norris, Elizabeth Rieke, Paul Tracy ... See all authors 🗸

First published: 23 February 2022 | https://doi.org/10.1002/saj2.20395

Assigned to Associate Editor Ryan D. Stewart

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/saj2.20395</u>

SOC (mg kg⁻¹)

- **—** 10
- 20
- **—** 30
- **—** 40

Conclusion

• Numerous soil health indicator options

• Most Responsive to Management

• Not all available at commercial laboratories

• Remove redundant measures to maximize knowledge



Rationale

Soil Health Interpretation at the Farm Level





SOIL HEALTH TARGETS TEAM

SHI 2021 InternsSHI StaffBrent ThomasDr. Cristine MorganQuanteria RandleDr. Nate LookerRobert ThomasDr. Dianna BagnallDr. Jason Ackerson

Dr. Vance Almquist





The Need for Quantifying Potential Soil Health Improvements



Treatment

➡ Conventional till + fallow



The Need for Quantifying Potential Soil Health Improvements





Rationale

The Need for Quantifying Potential Soil Health Improvements: Effects of Long-Term Adoption/Innovation





Rationale

The Need for Quantifying Potential Soil Health Improvements: Effects of Site Characteristics





Approach

Soil Health Targets Concept

Interpretable: Targets represent soil health achievable under optimal management (minimal disturbance, continuous living cover, ...)

Scalable: Targets can be quantified even in locations where long-term soil health management systems are absent

Locally relevant: Targets are defined for groups of soils with similar site characteristics relevant to soil health (inherent soil properties, topography, and climate)



Approach

Soil Health Groups

- Framework for site selection and reporting results
- Preliminary version implemented summer 2021
- Derived using publicly available data:
 - USDA-NRCS Soil Survey
 - Gridded climate products
 - Topographic attributes
- Soils are grouped according to inherent factors including:
 - Mineralogy
 - Texture
 - Drainage



Approach

Soil Health Groups

Soil map units



Soil health groups





Proof-of-Concept

Soil Health Targets for Cotton-Producing Soils





39 row crop fields and 52 targets

Targets: Soil Health under Optimal Management





Proof-of-Concept

INSTITUTE

Potential Improvements in Carbon Storage across Soils and Regions Arkansas Central Texas South Texas



24

Conclusion

- Multiple indicators provide complementary insights on potential improvements in soil functioning
- Soil health groups capture trends in soil health potential across soils and regions
- Reference sites give fuller picture of soil health potential for soils lacking examples of long-term SHMS adoption



Microbiome Measurements & Soil Health

1) Enhance interpretation of common soil health measurements

2) Use as a stand alone measure

- Specific organisms
- Functional characteristics





Bacterial & Archaeal Community Composition by Moisture Measurements







Climate Moisture Deficit



Drivers of Microbial Diversity





Goal

• Link changes in soil microbial community structure from tillage to potential carbon mineralization across North America

• Objectives:

- Define tillage influence on community structure
- Identify community members enriched under no-till systems across climates and soil types
- Identify organisms influential in Cmin measurements



Community Structure: Minimum vs. Intense Tillage

- 11 of 14 sites had significantly different (p<0.01) community structures due to tillage
- 3 non-significant sites were wheat-based rotations
 - Sites represented different climates and soil properties





Community Structure: Minimum vs. Intense Tillage

- 717 ASVs were enriched under minimum tillage
- Representing:
 - 16% of microbes in intense tillage
 - 33% of microbes in minimum tillage





Modeling Carbon Mineralization

 Average sequence importance averaged over 30 model runs





Modeling Carbon Mineralization

- Proteobacteria contributed the most
- 44% of sequences of model ASVs enriched under minimum tillage





Amplicon Sequence Variant

Modeling Carbon Mineralization

- Proteobacteria contributed the most
- 44% of sequences of model ASVs enriched under minimum tillage





Results- Acidobacteria Subdivision 6

- Enriched under no-till and important in predicting Cmin
- Acidobacteria present in wide range of soils
- Slow growing
- Adaptive to low nutrient concentrations
- Produces uncharacterized extracellular polymeric substances





Huber et al. 2016



Soil Biology and Biochemistry

Volume 168, May 2022, 108618



Linking soil microbial community structure to potential carbon mineralization: A continental scale assessment of reduced tillage

Elizabeth L. Rieke ^a A A, Shannon B. Cappellazzi ^a, Michael Cope ^a, Daniel Liptzin ^a, G. Mac Bean ^a, Kelsey L.H. Greub ^a, Charlotte E. Norris ^a, Paul W. Tracy ^a, Ezra Aberle ^b, Amanda Ashworth ^c, Oscar Bañuelos Tavarez ^d, Andy I. Bary ^e, R.L. Baumhardt ^f, Alberto Borbón Gracia ^g, Daniel C. Brainard ^h, Jameson R. Brennan ⁱ, Dolores Briones Reyes ^g, Darren Bruhjell ^j ... C. Wayne Honeycutt ^a



Acknowledgements

Contact: erieke@soilhealthinstitute.org

E Aberle O Bañuelos Tavarez A Bary R Baumhardt A Borbon Gracia D Brainard **D** Briones Reves D Bruhjell K Cammack C Carlyle J Crawford C Creech S Culman **B** Deen C Dell J Derner T Ducey S Duiker R Dungan M Dyck

B Ellert M Entz A Espinosa Solorio S Fonte S Fonteyne A Fortuna J Foster A Franzluebbers L Fultz A Gamble C Geddes J Grove **S** Hamilton X Hao Z Hayden **J** Heitman JHowe J Ippolito G Johnson M Kautz

N Kitchen S Kumar K Kurtz F Larney **K** Lewis M Liebig M Liebman A Lopez Ramirez S Machado **B** Maharjan M Martínez Gamiño W May M McClaran M McDaniel N Millar J Mitchell P Moore D Mora Gutierrez **K** Nelson E Omondi

S Osborne D Osmond L Osorio Alcalá J Paulk E Pena-Yewtukhiw H Poffenbarger **B** Ponce Lira J Reeve T Reinbott M Reiter E Ritchev K Roozeboom A Sadeghpour U Sainiu G Sanford W Schillinger **B** Schindelbeck M Schipanski A Schlegel K Scow

L Sherrod A Shober E Solis Moya M St. Luce J Strock A Suyker V Sykes Н Тао **M** Thompson A Trujillo Campos L Van Eerd N Verhulst T Vyn D Watts D Wright T Zhang

The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation General Mills Foundation for Food and Agriculture Research







ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Landowners & operators

NRCS in Texas & Arkansas

Texas A&M University & Texas A&M AgriLife Extension

Prairie View A&M University

University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff

Dr. Michael Young, UT Austin

Arkansas Game & Fish Commission

University of Arkansas System Division of Agriculture



This work is supported by the generosity of the Walmart Foundation.



Thank You for your Attention

www.soilhealthinstitute.org







erieke@soilhealthinstitute.org