

Date Received

For Administrative Use Only



PROJECT FINAL REPORT

Instructions:

- **Please note that making changes to the project without prior written consent from the funder(s) could constitute sufficient grounds for termination of funding.**
- This report must be a stand-alone report, *i.e.*, must be complete in and of itself. Scientific articles or other publications cannot be substituted for the report.
- A signed electronic copy of this report must be forwarded to the funders' representative on or before the due date, as per the investment agreement.
- A detailed, signed statement of revenues received and expenses incurred during the entire funding period of the project must be submitted along with this report, as per the investment agreement.
- For any questions regarding the preparation and submission of this report, please contact the funders' representative.

Section A: Project overview

1. Project number: 2017F020R
2. Project title: Harrington Seed Destructor Evaluation at Field Scale in Alberta
3. Abbreviations: HSD- Harrington Seed Destructor; HWSC- Harvest Weed Seed Control
4. Project start date: 2017/04/01
5. Project completion date: 2020/12/31
6. Final report submission date: 2021/01/31

7. Research and development team data	
a) Principal Investigator: (Requires personal data sheet (refer to Section 14) only if Principal Investigator has changed since last report.)	
Name	Institution
Breanne Tidemann	Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada
b) Research team members (List all team members. For each new team member, <i>i.e.</i> , joined since the last report, include a personal data sheet. Additional rows may be added if necessary.)	
Name	Institution
Hugh Beckie	Australian Herbicide Resistance Initiative
Troy Lucyshyn	PAMI
Neil Harker (retired)	AAFC Lacombe

Section B: Non-technical summary (max 1 page)

Herbicide resistant weeds continue to increase in incidence and frequency, limiting weed management options available to producers. New management strategies are needed for producers to continue to successfully manage their weeds. Harvest weed seed control (HWSC) is a paradigm of weed control that focuses on managing weeds that are being spread by the combine harvester. These weeds retain their seeds until crop harvest, produce weeds at a height where they can be collected, and are successfully taken into the combine. One method of harvest weed seed control that may have a fit in western Canada are the physical impact mills. The original tow-behind Harrington Seed Destructor is an example of an impact mill that is available for testing in western Canada. From 2017-2019, 20 producer fields had research plots established in weedy areas. These plots were broken into either untreated checks, or harvested with the Harrington Seed Destructor. Seedling counts were conducted the following springs (2018-2020). In 2020, weed seedbank samples were also collected. Results of the seedling counts are showing minimal statistically significant differences in terms of reducing weed seedling populations. There are some numeric trends that suggest early levels of success in managing some of the top weed species in these fields, but certainly not all of them. Additional analyses will be completed once the seedbank data is available, including complete population density ANOVAs and multivariate analyses to determine the impact of cropping system and harvest with the HSD on the weed populations.

Section C: Project details

1. Background (max 1 page)

Herbicide resistant weeds incidence and frequency continues to increase across the Canadian Prairies (Beckie et al. 2020). At the same time, discoveries of new herbicide modes of action that could manage resistant weed species have been declining in frequency (Duke 2012). This leaves a shortage of herbicide management options for many weed species, and increases selection pressure for resistance to those herbicides which are still effective. As a result there is increasing focus on non-herbicide methods of managing weeds in Canada as well as globally.

In Australia, there has been development and adoption of a weed management method known as harvest weed seed control (HWSC). This method focuses on managing weeds expelled from combine harvesters in the chaff fraction so as to prevent additions to the weed seed bank (Walsh et al. 2013). There are a number of methods of HWSC including narrow windrow burning, chaff lining/tramlining, chaff collection, bale direct systems, and physical impact mill systems. Expert opinion expects physical impact mills to be the most likely method of HWSC to be adopted on a large scale in western Canada due to reduced requirements for additional management, no requirement for burning or towing, and high levels of efficacy. There are a number of physical impact mills now on the market including the iHSD (integrated Harrington Seed Destructor, produced by deBruin), the Seed Terminator, the Seed Control Unit (Redekop Manufacturing) and the WeedHOG.

However, HWSC is not effective on all weeds. For weeds to be managed via HWSC methods they must be retained at the time of harvest, at a height from which the harvester can collect them (Walsh et al. 2013). For problematic weeds in Australia such as annual ryegrass or wild radish, these conditions are met. Problematic Canadian weeds vary in their suitability for HWSC (Burton et al. 2016, 2017; Beckie et al. 2017, Tidemann et al. 2017B). As an example, volunteer canola and cleavers are expected to make good targets for HWSC methods while the low levels of seed retention until crop harvest are a concern for species such as wild oat (*Avena fatua* L.) (Walsh et al. 2018). While efficacy evaluations of the Harrington Seed Destructor (expected to be representative of most of the physical impact mill systems) have been conducted on Canadian weeds (Tidemann et al. 2017A), field scale evaluations of the HSD have not been completed/published in Canada or in North America to date. The tow-behind Harrington Seed Destructor is now an obsolete version of the physical impact mills, however results are expected to be representative of other cage/hammer mill systems (Seed Terminator, and Seed Control Unit). The results would likely overestimate efficacy of the WeedHOG, which is based on a different mill system and tends to show lower levels of efficacy on processed weeds.

2. Objectives and deliverables (max 1 page)

The original objective was to evaluate the efficacy of the Harrington Seed Destructor on weeds in Alberta and determine if efficacy varies by cropping system and management choices. The short term objective was to determine the effect of the Harrington Seed Destructor on weed populations in Alberta. The long term objective was to determine if the Harrington Seed Destructor is a viable weed management option in Alberta, and which cropping systems and practices it is suited for.

Planned deliverables:

The primary deliverable was knowledge on if the HSD was effective on weeds in Canadian cropping systems. In addition there are plans for a scientific manuscript, as well as presentations at conferences, grower meetings, agronomy updates, etc.

3. Research design and methodology (max 4 pages)

20 producer fields were identified within an approximately 50 km distance from Lacombe (Figure 1) where there was, at a minimum, a large patch of a problematic weed. The goal was to select producers starting in canola, wheat and peas with swathed and straight cut harvest timings in wheat and canola. Because of logistics, we struggled to find producers within a reasonable area who were swathing wheat. However, the desired crops were found at the start of the project and then rotations were allowed to vary as per farm rotation. Crop rotations and harvest system of each of the 20 fields is presented in Table 1.

In each field the size of the weed patch was scouted. That area was then broken into six plots. This allowed for 3 replicates of an untreated/regular harvest to be implement and 3 replicates of a Harrington Seed Destructor harvest to be implemented in each field, although the size of the plots/replicates varied by field. Prior to the initial harvest, weed counts were conducted across the entire trial area, by species, to determine what populations were there at harvest. The first harvest was conducted in fall of 2017. All 20 fields were successfully harvested.

In spring of 2018 pre-spraying seedling counts were conducted in all 20 fields. To determine weed densities 20 quadrats per plot were counted with weeds identified and counted by species. A smaller (10 quadrats per plot) pre-harvest survey was conducted in fall of 2018. In fall of 2018, 19 out of 20 fields were harvested. One field was seeded to hemp and due to harvest challenges with that crop we did not combine with the HSD in that field that year.

In spring of 2019 pre-spraying seedling counts were again conducted in all 20 fields. Weed densities were determined by species through 20 quadrat counts, as above. A final pre-harvest survey was again conducted in fall of 2019. All 20 fields were harvested with expected treatments in fall of 2019.

In spring of 2020 final pre-spraying seedling counts were conducted in all fields using 20 quadrat counts per plot. In addition to emerged seedling counts, 15 4" diameter soil cores were sampled to a depth of 2" in each plot to evaluated weed seedbank densities. Soil cores were washed through a series of sieves to reduce the overall size of the sample without losing any weed seeds. Samples were then processed through a clipper cleaner into two fractions. One where large seeded weeds could be removed by hand, with a focus on wild oat or other large weeds with dormancy, and the other that required growth time in a growth chamber to identify weeds. We had hoped to process the samples through washing and hand removal of weeds only, and had worked at building a protocol to allow us to do so. However, the soil that we tested the protocol with did not have as high of a sand content as the soil in our seedbank samples from our producer fields. This posed a problem for small seeded weeds such as chickweed which is nearly impossible to separate by hand from sand. As a result we have had to revert to the grow out method of evaluating species in the soil seedbank. Each sample is grown out by plot, and is grown under controlled growth conditions for 3 weeks in a growth chamber. As weeds emerge they are identified to species and removed. After the three week period samples are placed in a freezer for 3 weeks. After the freezing period they are removed from the freezer, the soil is

mixed/disturbed, and they are placed under grow lights in a temperature controlled room. Emerged seedlings are again identified to species and removed. If a third grow out is required, that is conducted after an additional freezing period.

Unfortunately, due to the extended time required to process each sample through the seedbank grow out method, this data collection is ongoing. We had hoped to bypass this lengthy process by using the washing method. We can successfully use this method for wild oats but not for smaller seeded weeds when sand content is high. The overall seedbank information is therefore not completed. Results of the seedbank analysis will be completed and analyzed later at which time those results will be forward on to the funding agencies to complete the final report. We apologize for this inconvenience but were unable to speed up this portion of the data collection as we had hoped.

Statistical analysis: Top weeds were identified out of each field, to allow for summary of a simply massive amount of data. This was based on the top 5 weeds in the field that were present at a density of more than 50 m⁻². Data were analyzed using generalized linear mixed models ANOVA in SAS 9.4. Distributions were selected based on Akaike's Corrected Information criterion and an examination of the residuals. Analysis was conducted across all fields for total number of weeds counted in the spring of 2020 (seedling emergence count). For top weeds, analysis was conducted across all fields in the spring of 2020 that were associated with that weed as a top weed using treatment as a fixed effect and rep nested in field ID as a random effects. In addition an ANOVA was conducted by field for each top weed where treatment was a fixed effect and replicate was a random effect. We are in the midst of also doing a multivariate analysis, however, unresolved problems with my SAS program and computer hardware have not allowed me to complete that analysis in time for this report. Details of that analysis will be included with the results of the soil seedbank measurements.

4. Results, discussion and conclusions (max 8 pages)

The first result that needs to be highlighted is that all 20 producers fields remained in the project for the entire duration of the project. This is quite unusual when it comes to producer field projects, particularly when a trial is set up in their fields, and their fields aren't being used for just a survey. We did have a few bumps in the road (one field out of the trial for one harvest due to growing hemp, a producer not spraying any weed control in the HSD trial area so we could "really test that machine", etc.) but all fields were maintained as part of the project for the entire duration. This is exciting and gives us a large database of data to work with.

The initial ANOVA analysis results show limited significant differences between the check and the HSD treatments. There are, however, also some interesting trends to highlight, as well information and understanding to be gained from future multivariate analyses as well as the data collected from the seedbank samples.

Focussing on the measurement of total weed densities, there was no significant difference between the check treatment and the HSD treatment when analyzed across fields. In fact, the mean densities were quite similar (225 vs 228 m⁻²). Although we would have hoped to have seen a difference, it's not surprising that we did not considering this is analyzed across all weed species. This project intentionally included species that were expected to be good targets for HWSC as a result of their measured or observed seed retention, as well as species that were not expected to be good targets based on height or seed retention, in order to be able to demonstrate a difference and an impact that is species specific. When analyzed across fields there were only 3 fields with significant differences between treatments, none of which were as a result of decreased weed densities in the HSD treatment. Possible reasons that we may see increased weed densities in the HSD treatment will be discussed later.

Cleavers was the most common top weed in the study, ranking as a top weed in 15/20 fields. In only two fields was there a measured significant difference between treatments. One where the HSD had higher densities than the untreated, and one where densities were significantly reduced. However, interestingly, cleavers densities were numerically lower in 10/15 fields. Cleavers was a weed that was expected to be reduced in densities from the HSD treatments, based on measured seed retention values (Tidemann et al. 2017B). It is possible that with additional years under HSD treatment, some of the numerical reductions in densities would become statistically significant. Weed densities, being highly variable in producer fields, can be difficult to differentiate statistically. It is also worth noting that cleavers densities in spring of 2020 were very high in all fields compared to previous years. The weather in 2020 proved to be good "cleavers weather" which may also impact our ability to differentiate between the untreated and the HSD treatments. Overall I would have expected higher control of this species, which leads me to question the high densities overall in 2020, and the potential to measure differences in future years. The seedbank densities of cleavers will be a valuable component to this comparison.

Wild oat/volunteer cereals was one of the next most common top weeds, ranking as a top weed in 14/20 fields. Volunteer cereals were combined with wild oats. Seedling counts were taken in the spring, prior to farmers applying an in-crop herbicide. In some cases herbicide applications were made when the wild oat/volunteer cereals were only one leaf and incredibly difficult to identify without digging up every plant, and even then if the seed is lost it is incredibly difficult. As a result, due to time constraints and a need for efficiency, the volunteer cereals and wild oats have been combined for analysis to remove any possibility of incorrect data from misidentification. The majority of these weeds are believed to be wild oat. Across all fields where wild oat was a top weed there was no significant difference between the untreated and the HSD treatments. There were four fields where there were significant differences in wild oat densities between the HSD and the untreated; in 2 cases wild oat densities were reduced with the HSD and in 2 they were increased. When looking at numeric means wild oat densities were only reduced in 6/14 fields where it was a top weed. Limited efficacy on wild oat was expected from the HSD, due to early seed shed in this species (Tidemann et al. 2017B). An interesting observation is that in field 12, where wild oat densities were significantly reduced by the HSD, we observed high levels of seed retention in the wild oat

plants in the field at harvest in 2017. It's possible that increased seed retention is a biotype feature of that wild oat population which allowed for the HSD to be more effective. This is a hypothesis only, as wild oat biotypes have not been examined for differences in seed retention to date. Overall, limited impact on this species in terms of seedling numbers is not unexpected, although it is disappointing. The seedbank numbers and the ability to do a full population comparison will be important to finalizing these results.

Volunteer canola was also a top weed in 14/20 fields. There were no significant differences between the untreated and the HSD treatments across fields or in any fields. Even numerically there were only 4/14 fields where volunteer densities were lower in the HSD treatments. This is frankly very surprising based on the seed retention of volunteer canola (Tidemann et al. 2017B), suggesting that it would make a very good target for HWSC. The seedbank samples may provide important information here. It is possible that when seedbank densities are high, a limited number of individuals are able to germinate and emerge. However, when seedbank densities are reduced, each individual has a higher probability of germinating because of better seed-soil contact, more 'safe-sites', and more niche availability. It will be very interesting to compare the seedbank numbers to the emerged seedling densities. If seedbank densities also reflect limited impact on canola densities, it will be important to determine why. In theory canola meets all the criteria for a good target for HWSC (good seed retention, excellent height of seed retention, easily combined), so identifying why we weren't able to measure an impact is important. It's possible that volunteer canola is shattering out when the header contacts it and is dropped to the soil prior to entering the combine, or that it is being expelled in a non-chaff fraction. These questions will be determined/strengthened after the seedbank analysis is complete.

Chickweed was a top weed in 13/20 fields. There was no significant difference between the HSD treatment and the untreated check across fields or in any of the 13 fields. This is unsurprising. Chickweed is a very low growing weed and produces many of its seeds under the crop cutting height. It is unlikely that many retained seed can be collected due to the low height of production. Chickweed is another weed that was quite abundant in spring of 2020, apparently appreciating the weather conditions that were received early in the growing season.

Hempnettle was a top weed in 7/20 fields. There was no significant reduction in hempnettle densities across or in any of the 7 fields. However, in field 2, there is no test of difference between the treatments possible. Two replicates of the HSD treatment had no hempnettle counted. As a result there was only one replicate of the HSD treatment with a density value. As there is no variance to the measured density for that treatment (only one measured value) an ANOVA is not possible. Numerically, the HSD treatment had fewer hempnettle plants than the untreated check. Including field 2, there were lower hempnettle densities in 5/7 fields with hempnettle as a top weed, suggesting there may be some efficacy on this species. Expected efficacy on this species was unknown – seed retention has not been measured, but appeared likely to be conducive to control with HWSC.

Sowthistle was also a top weed in 7/20 fields. There were no significant reductions in sowthistle densities compared to the untreated across fields or in any of the fields. There was only one significant difference between the HSD and the untreated in field 8 and it did not result in a reduction in densities in the HSD treatment. Numerically there is no trend towards reduced populations in the HSD treatments. Sowthistle was expected to be a poor target for the HSD based on limited seed retention (Beckie et al. 2018) so it is not surprising to not measure a larger impact on this weed based on seedling counts alone.

Wild buckwheat was identified as a top weed in 4/20 fields. While there were no significant reductions in density across or within any of the fields, it is interesting to note that in all comparisons the buckwheat density was numerically lower in the HSD treatment. Most of these numeric differences were very minor, however. Buckwheat is expected to be a good target for HWSC based on high seed retention (Burton et al. 2016, 2017). This will be another species that will be interesting to determine the seedbank densities and complete a population density analysis.

Green foxtail, field violet, storksbill and cornspurry/field horsetail were all top weeds in 2/20 fields, but there were no significant differences in control in the HSD vs the untreated for any of them. There was a numeric trend to reductions in density of storksbill, although as mentioned previously the difference was not significant. Cornspurry and field horsetail are combined, again due to risk of misidentification at the early seedling stage. It is unlikely that the HSD would have significant effects on these species as they are typically lower growing species, or do not reproduce by seed (field horsetail). It is possible that green foxtail would make a better target in other locations where it has been known to grow taller, as seed retention has been measured to be quite high at harvest (Burton et al. 2016, 2017).

White cockle, shepherd's purse, willowherb, lambsquarters, dandelion and toadflax were all top weeds in 1/20 fields. Only shepherd's purse showed a significant difference between the HSD and untreated check, with a reduced seedling density in the HSD treatment. Some of the species (white cockle, toadflax, and dandelion) are unlikely to make good targets due to biennial/perennial natures.

While we would have hoped to see more dramatic reductions in weed seedling populations after 3 years, there are a number of factors that could have limited efficacy. The first being dormancy – large seedbanks of species that have dormancy may make it difficult to determine efficacy of the HSD in such a short timeframe. However, it was simply uneconomical to do a longer term study at this point. In addition, the 2018 harvest was interrupted by early snowfall which could also have caused additional weed seed loss, reducing efficacy substantially in the second year of the study. I am not at this point willing to say that the HSD did not work, particularly without analyzing the seedbank data. A weed population is made up not only of the plants we see growing above the surface, but also of those individuals that remain in the seedbank. Once the seedbank data is completed a population density analysis will occur. In addition the multivariate analysis that we are working on will allow us to compare cropping systems in addition to the straightforward treatment effects looked at in the ANOVA's. This

analysis will be conducted on the seedling growth, as well as on the entire population density (seedling plus seedbank numbers). I apologize again for not having the seedbank data to present at this point, but having to resort to growing out the samples with limited controlled growth facilities greatly extended the time needed to collect the data. Of course the soil seedbank sampling only occurred at the end of the study which gives no time to adapt to the change in protocol without it impacting the timeline and available results at the time of this report. An updated final report will be provided with a report and discussion of entire population density once it is completed. One factor that would have been nice to include more frequently in the studying is swathing at harvest. Swathing of cereals is quite limited in the Lacombe area, as we discovered when trying to set up the project. We were able to find fields/systems that included swathing at least once in the rotation 9 times and a few additional that included swathing twice. This should give us lots to work with for pulling out any advantage to incorporating swathing for management with the HSD.

5. Literature cited

- Beckie HJ, Shirriff SW, Leeson JY, Hall LM, Harker KN, Dokken-Bouchard F, Brenzil CA (2020) Herbicide-resistant weeds in the Canadian Prairies: 2012 to 2017. *Weed Tech* 34:461-474.
- Beckie HJ, Blackshaw RE, Harker KN, Tidemann BD (2018) Weed seed shatter in spring wheat in Alberta. *Can J Plant Sci* 98:107-114.
- Beckie HJ, Shirriff SW, Leeson JY, Hall LM, Harker KN (2019) Alberta Weed Survey: Herbicide-resistant weeds 2017. Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada, Saskatoon, SK. 39 pp.
- Burton NR, Beckie HJ, Willenborg CJ, Shirliff SJ, Schoenau JJ, Johnson EN (2016) Evaluating seed shatter of economically important weed species. *Weed Sci* 64:673-682.
- Burton NR, Beckie HJ, Willenborg CJ, Shirliff SJ, Schoenau JJ, Johnson EN (2017) Seed shatter of six economically important weed species in producer fields in Saskatchewan. *Can J Plant Sci* 97:266-276.
- Duke SO (2012) Why have no new herbicide modes of action appeared in recent years? *Pest Manag Sci* 68:505-512.
- Tidemann BD, Hall LM, Harker KN, Beckie HJ (2017A) Factors affecting weed seed devitalization with the Harrington seed destructor. *Weed Sci* 65:650-658.
- Tidemann BD, Hall LM, Harker KN, Beckie HJ, Johnson EN, Stevenson FC (2017B) Suitability of wild oat (*Avena fatua*), false cleavers (*Galium spurium*), and volunteer canola (*Brassica napus*) for harvest weed seed control in western Canada. *Weed Sci* 65:769-777.
- Walsh M, Newman P, Powles S (2013) Targeting weed seeds in-crop: A new weed control paradigm for global agriculture. *Weed Tech* 27:431-436.
- Walsh MJ, Broster JC, Schwartz-Lazaro LM, Norsworthy JK, Davis AS, Tidemann BD, Beckie HJ, Lyon DJ, Soni N, Neve P, Bagavathiannan MV (2018) Opportunities and challenges for harvest weed seed control in global cropping systems. *Pest Manag Sci* 74: 2235-2245.

6. Project team (max ½ page)

Breanne Tidemann- Project lead, responsible for data collation, project oversight, data analysis and knowledge transfer.

Neil Harker- Responsible for guidance and insight on project initiation up until his retirement

Troy Lucyshyn – Responsible for oversight of PAMI project participants and expenditures, providing equipment to complete harvests, reporting for PAMI

Hugh Beckie- Providing insight and guidance on project set-up, data analysis and will be assisting with manuscript preparation. Hugh moved from Agriculture and Agri-Food Canada to the Australian Herbicide Resistance Initiative but has continued to provide guidance and insight for the project.

7. Benefits to the industry (max 1 page; respond to sections a) and b) separately)

a) Describe the impact of the project results on the Alberta or western Canadian agriculture and food industry (results achieved and potential short-term, medium-term and long-term outcomes).

In the short-term, with current data the HSD is showing limited benefit for western Canadian producers. However, this may change significantly once the seedbank data, and a full population density analysis are completed. If we are able to show a benefit of the machine on entire weed density then we can explain expected efficacy levels to producers and they can determine whether the additional tool makes sense in terms of on-farm investment. If we do not show a benefit of the machine on weed density after the population analysis then we will have saved farmers from investing in a machine that is unlikely to work in western Canadian conditions.

b) Quantify the potential economic impact of the project results (*e.g.*, cost-benefit analysis, potential size of market, improvement in efficiency, etc.).

This is difficult to determine without having completed the full population analysis. If the project is successful there is a very large market for uptake of HWSC methods in western Canada. At this time uptake of HWSC methods has already begun to slowly occur since the initiation of the study in 2017. There were 4 impact mill units running in Saskatchewan as of harvest 2020, and a Canadian manufacturer has entered the HWSC game. Anecdotal and informal discussion suggests there will be at least 7 units running in Saskatchewan as of harvest 2021, with a few additional producers being interested in potentially purchasing impact mills as well. The economic impact of herbicide resistant weeds in Alberta was estimated at \$17/acre in the last Alberta HR survey. Impact mills may provide a way to help manage those weeds and that economic cost to producers. These benefits to the industry will also be updated after the seedbank data is completed.

8. Contribution to training of highly qualified personnel (max ½ page)

Over the three years of harvests, in addition to the final year of counts there were 3-4 summer students each year hired on to the research crew that helped with seedling counts,

pre-harvest surveys, and soil sampling. This leads to a total training of HQP of approximately 9 students as some of the students worked on the project for more than one year. This included a significant amount of training in weed ID, especially at the seedling stage, but also discussion on project set-up, working with producers, disinfection procedures, etc.

9. Knowledge transfer/technology transfer/commercialisation (max 1 page)

Describe how the project results were communicated to the scientific community, to industry stakeholders, and to the general public. Please ensure that you include descriptive information, such as the date, location, etc. Organise according to the following categories as applicable:

- a) **Scientific publications.** A scientific manuscript has not yet been prepared as we are still completing collection of the final data from the seedbank portion of the study. Once that has been completed and analyzed a scientific manuscript will be prepared and submitted for open access publication to a scientific journal.
- b) **Industry-oriented publications.** No publications of this nature have yet been prepared. There have been articles about harvest weed seed control and the fact that this project has been ongoing including:

February 2018	Interview with Ron Lyseng of the Western Producer on Mechanical Weed Control, Harvest Weed Seed Control and the Harrington Seed Destructor. Given at CropConnect 2018 in Winnipeg, MB.
April 2018	Interview for the Alberta Wheat Commission on weed science research in Lacombe and the Harrington Seed Destructor. Video shared via Agronomy Newsletter and posted online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o5cBJ7inmN4&app=desktop
September 2018	Interview with Treena Hein for the article “Manage Weeds with the Combine” in the September 2018 issue of Canola Digest.
February 2019	Interview with Treena Hein for the article “Seek and Destroy: The control of herbicide-resistant weeds through seed destruction” published in the Spring 2019 issue of the Alberta Seed Guide.
March 2019	Interview with Donna Fleury for the article “Crushing Seed to Prevent Weeds” in the March 2019 issue of Top Crop Manager.
June 2019	Interview with Julienne Isaacs for the article “Harvest weed seed control gains momentum in western Canada” for Country Guide
December 2019	Interview with Western Producer on harvest weed seed control. Published in “Canadian Cage Mill Teams up with JD” by Robin Booker, December 19, 2019. Available: https://www.producer.com/2019/12/video-canadian-cage-mill-teams-up-with-jd/
September 2020	Extension article by Bruce Barker for Top Crop Manager on harvest weed seed control in western Canada. Available at: https://mydigitalpublication.com/publication/?m=1031&i=670335&p=30

- c) **Scientific Presentations.** Scientific presentation on this project have been limited as I have waited until we have final data to push the extension at scientific conferences, etc.

The final year's data is the most important component and once the analysis is complete there will be a number of scientific presentations done.

I did however present on Harvest Weed Seed Control, and the fact that this project was occurring in:

2017 **Tidemann BD** (2017) Harvest Weed Seed Control. Canadian Weed Science Society Annual Meeting. Abstract

- d) **Industry-oriented presentations.** Throughout this activity there have been a number of industry-oriented talks given on harvest weed seed control in general, each of which have introduced that this project is ongoing, that we are trying to measure the impact of physical impact mills in a field setting and where we had gotten to at that point with the project. These presentations included:

February 2018	Tidemann BD (2018) Mechanical Weed Control and Harvest Weed Seed Control. Invited presentation at CropConnect 2018, Winnipeg, MB.
February 2018	Tidemann BD (2018) Harvest Weed Seed Control. Invited presentation at the Herbicide Resistance Summit, 2018, Saskatoon, SK.
December 2019	Tidemann BD (2019) Harvest weed seed control in Canada. Invited presentation at Farm Forum Event 2019 in Saskatoon, SK. Dr. Tidemann also served as a Breakfast Table Talk speaker for 2 days on the topic of HWSC.
December 2019	Tidemann BD (2019) Herbicide resistance, seed banks and the future. Invited presentation at the Winfield United Acres of Ideas Academy in Saskatoon, SK.
December 2019	Tidemann BD (2019) Depleting the weed seed bank. Invited presentation at the Farming Smarter 2019 Conference in Lethbridge, AB.
June 2019	Tidemann BD (2019) Harvest Weed Seed Control. BD Tidemann spoke at the harvest weed seed control station at CanolaPalooza held June 26, 2019 where over 700 people attended. She was able to discuss new weed management methodologies as well as ongoing AAFC research.
January 2020	Tidemann BD (2020) Herbicide Resistance, Integrated Weed Management and Harvest Weed Seed Control. Invited presentation at the Peace Region Agronomy Update meeting in Fairview, AB. Approximately 80 people in attendance.
January 2020	Tidemann BD (2020) Herbicide Resistance, Integrated Weed Management and Harvest Weed Seed Control. Invited presentation for Mackenzie Applied Research Association extension day in Fort Vermilion, AB. Approximately 40 people in attendance.

- e) **Media activities.** Extension activities where this project has been mentioned includes:

February 2018	Video interview with Real Agriculture on the Harrington Seed Destructor Project and Mechanical Weed Control. Given at CropConnect 2018 in Winnipeg, MB
April 2018	Interview for the Alberta Wheat Commission on weed science research in Lacombe and the Harrington Seed Destructor. Video shared via Agronomy Newsletter and posted online at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o5cBJ7inmN4&app=desktop

June 2019	Interview with Kara Oosterhuis of RealAgriculture on the Harrington Seed Destructor and Harvest Weed Seed control for Wheat School from CanolaPaloosa. June 26, 2019. Available: https://www.realagriculture.com/2019/07/wheat-school-seed-destroyer-enters-its-third-year-of-an-alberta-based-research-study/
August 2019	Interview with Jennifer Blair for the article “Is the weed seed ‘destroyer’ ready for prime time in Alberta” published in Alberta Farmer Express on October 29, 2019. Available: https://www.albertafarmexpress.ca/2019/10/29/is-weed-seed-destroyer-ready-for-prime-time-in-alberta/
August 2019	Podcast with Jeremy Boychen of Alberta Wheat on harvest weed seed control and the Harrington Seed Destructor for the Growing Point. Released August 18, 2019.
December 2019	Interview with Shaun Haney from Real Agriculture on harvest weed seed control. Published in “Options for weed seed control at harvest expanding for Canadian Farmers”. Available at: https://www.realagriculture.com/2020/01/options-for-weed-seed-control-at-harvest-expanding-for-canadian-farmers/

f) Any commercialisation activities or patents: none.

N.B.: Any publications and/or presentations should acknowledge the contribution of each of the funders of the project, as per the investment agreement.

Section D: Project resources

- 1. Provide a detailed listing of all cash revenues to the project and expenditures of project cash funds in a separate document certified by the organisation’s accountant or other senior executive officer, as per the investment agreement.** Revenues should be identified by funder, if applicable. Expenditures should be classified into the following categories: personnel; travel; capital assets; supplies; communication, dissemination and linkage (CDL); and overhead (if applicable).
Please see the attached pdf document for the expenditures.
- 2. Provide a justification of project expenditures and discuss any major variance (i.e., ± 10%) from the budget approved by the funder(s).**

The largest variance from the approved budget is in personnel costs. To allow for efficiencies in managing of accounts, students were hired out of funding for other projects. As a result, no student wages were charged to this project. However, supply costs were also much higher than anticipated. Some materials and supplies such as flags and quadrats were budgeted for, however the project lead didn’t take into consideration the costs of disinfectants for vehicles, equipment and personnel moving between farmer fields, sprayers to apply that disinfectant, the need to replace flags, sprayers, etc. We also purchased more flags than initially planned for use at the multiple times we were in the field, and needed to invest in a more accurate GPS to allow us to find the plots from year to year. We’ve also had some unanticipated costs surrounding the need to grow out soil seedbank samples. This has resulted in the need to purchase potting soil, trays, and grow lights due to the vast number of samples needing to be processed exceeding available growth cabinet space. Travel was higher in most years than was budgeted for, due to optimism around how quickly the fields could be harvested, and not anticipating the fall snowfalls. The

CDL funds budgeted were allocated for publication of a scientific publication which has not yet been completed due to the extended time needed for data collection and analysis. ‘Other’ expenditures include costs of science service costs primarily, as well as other purchases that may not have been correctly labelled or don’t fall cleanly into another category. Overall, all funds have been spent, although unanticipated expenses as well as salaries being covered by other projects have led to expenditures in a different breakdown than was initially budgeted. If there are any concerns about how the funds were spent I am happy to discuss this further. I am only reporting on AAFC budget expenditures as PAMI has reported separately.

3. Resources:

Provide a list of all external cash and in-kind resources which were contributed to the project.

Total resources contributed to the project		
Source	Amount	Percentage of total project cost
Agriculture Funding Consortium	\$664, 935	62%
Other government sources: Cash		%
Other government sources: In-kind	\$415,406	38%
Industry: Cash		%
Industry: In-kind		%
Total Project Cost	\$1,080,341	100%

External resources (additional rows may be added if necessary)		
Government sources		
Name (no abbreviations unless stated in Section A3)	Amount cash	Amount in-kind
Agriculture and Agri-food Canada Lacombe		\$415,406
Industry sources		
Name (no abbreviations unless stated in Section A3)	Amount cash	Amount in-kind