



COVER CROP BENEFITS AND NOVEL MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR THE SOUTHEASTERN UNITED STATES

Eric D. Billman¹, W. Tillman Myers¹

¹Coastal Plains Soil, Water, and Plant Research Center, USDA-ARS, 2611 W. Lucas St., Florence, SC 29501

Corresponding author email: eric.billman@usda.gov

Abstract

Soils used for agricultural production in the southeastern United States are traditionally known to be highly weathered and have low nutrient-holding capacities. Consequently, regenerative and sustainable cropping practices are necessary to maintain high crop yields, soil health, water conservation, carbon sequestration, and environmental sustainability. Cover crops may offer various solutions in all these areas. This review-in-brief highlights the historical use, common cover cropping species and management systems, water-usage, and soil relationships of cover crops in the southeastern US. Current and future research directions being investigated by federal and state institutions are also discussed to inform stakeholders of ongoing projects related to cover crops in the Southeast.

Keywords: cover crops, southeastern USA, soil health, water conservation

Introduction

Cover crops have been critically important to improving agricultural cropping systems around the world. Their benefits have been widely documented amid both agronomic and horticultural crop production. Soil health has been one of the largest beneficiaries of cover crop adoption, with focus on minimizing soil erosion, improving soil structure and tilth, increasing soil fertility, increasing soil organic matter, and increasing water infiltration. Ecosystem services, such as weed and pest suppression, and provision of pollinator habitat are also noted to benefit from the production of winter annual cover crops in modern agricultural production. This review highlights the historical use of cover crops in the southeastern United States (North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Tennessee, and Florida), as well as the benefits that cover crop adoption has provided to crop production specific to the region. Additionally, novel uses of cover crops will also be discussed, along with their potential uses for different agronomic or horticultural cropping systems unique to the Southeast.

Historical Use and Dissemination in the Southeast

Widespread cover crop implementation is a somewhat novel concept for much of the southeastern United States. Most row-cropping systems (i.e., cotton, corn, soybean) only began implementing cover crops in the mid-late 1980s and expanded through the 1990s (Raper et al., 2000). Prior to this, fields remained in fallow following fall harvest until the subsequent spring (a period ranging from 5 – 7 months, depending on crop rotation scheme). When coupled with conventional tillage,

38 this practice exacerbated the risk of topsoil erosion to wind and precipitation during winter months.
39 Recognition of these issues increased expansion of no-till agriculture during the late 20th century,
40 but soils are still at risk of significant erosion losses when no root or organic matter is present to
41 hold soil in place (Frasier et al., 2016). This led to greater adoption of cover crops into the
42 Southeast in the 1990s, but the practice is not ubiquitous in the region as of the early 2020s.

43 Recent research examining the additive effects of no-till or conservation (> 30% residue
44 remaining) tillage in combination with cover crops has found that soil erosion is reduced when
45 both are paired together (Jacobs et al., 2022). Long-term research (1979 – 2020) from the USDA's
46 Agricultural Research Service (ARS) and Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has also
47 found that combining conservation tillage with cover crops can improve soil organic matter and
48 nitrogen concentration when using a simple three species cover crop mixture (Novak et al., 2020).
49 Much of the southeast U.S. is comprised of heavily depleted sandy soils with low pH and nutrient-
50 holding capacities, which has been further exacerbated due to centuries of monoculture production
51 and conventional tillage dating back to colonial times (Trimble, 1974). While no-tillage can
52 minimize further soil depletion, cover crops offer ways to rejuvenate soils by providing vital
53 organic matter, macro- and micromineral fertility, soil structure, and increased microbial activity.

54 There are, however, factors that have limited adoption of cover crops in the southeastern US.
55 Additional costs are a particular barrier to adoption. Not only does the seed cost growers an
56 additional expense, but there is also time, labor, and equipment costs associated with the practice
57 of cover cropping. Most cover crops do not provide an immediate economic benefit, i.e., they do
58 not produce a sellable commodity that brings in additional income. This makes much of the
59 benefits of cover crops less tangible to producers, and limits willingness to invest in their use.
60 Current and future research is focused on providing profitable options for cover cropping, while
61 also providing data that determines how effective cover crops are at improving on-farm profits of
62 the subsequent cash crop.

63 **Common Plant Families and Species**

64 Cover cropping is defined as growing an off-season, low-input crop between primary cash crops,
65 maintaining it through winter, and terminating it the following spring prior to planting of the next
66 cash crop (Roesch-McNally et al., 2018). Because of this, winter annual grass and legume species
67 are well-suited to filling this niche. Traditionally, cereal grain species such as winter wheat
68 (*Triticum aestivum* L.), cereal rye (*Secale cereale* L.), or triticale [\times *Triticosecale* Wittm. ex A.
69 Camus (*Secale* \times *Triticum*)] have been used in the southeastern US because they can provide rapid
70 accumulation of biomass and are tolerant of sub-freezing temperatures (Mirsky et al., 2012). As
71 for legumes, crimson clover (*Trifolium incarnatum* L.), hairy vetch (*Vicia villosa* Roth), or balansa
72 clover (*Trifolium michelianum* Savi) are commonly incorporated into binary or trinary mixtures
73 with cereal grain species (Vann et al., 2019). This is primarily done to replenish soil nitrogen and
74 minimize the need for fertilizer applications on the companion cereal grain species. Aside from
75 these benefits, there is conflicting information on the efficacy of weed control with diversifying

76 cover crop mixtures. Weed suppression has been found to be generally poorer under leguminous
77 cover crops compared to grasses (Baraibar et al., 2018; Bybee-Finley et al., 2017; Elsalahy et al.,
78 2019). However, there have been some reported instances of increased cover crop mixture
79 diversity providing increased weed suppression (Tracy et al., 2004). Tall, fast-growing species are
80 most effective at suppressing weed populations, which tends to favor the cereal grasses.

81 **Limitations to Current Cover Crop Species and Practices**

82 Over the last 20 years there has been little attempt to broaden the species or methods used for cover
83 cropping in the southeastern US (Nouri et al., 2019; Lewis et al., 2018). This may be problematic
84 to future agricultural production in the region for several reasons. Excessive growth of cereal
85 grains both depletes soil nutrient reserves and increases soil carbon-to-nitrogen ratios (C:N;
86 DeLaune et al., 2019). This can negatively affect nutrient availability to subsequent cash crops by
87 reducing soil microbial activity. High C:N can effectively immobilize macronutrient (N, P, K, Mg,
88 and S) availability by preventing microbial breakdown (Tahir and Marschner et al., 2017). Cereal
89 rye is particularly problematic in this regard, as it produces more biomass than other cereal grasses.
90 If allowed to reach reproductive maturity, cereal rye tissue builds up more secondary cell wall
91 components, including lignin, which further increases C:N. Therefore, it is recommended that most
92 cereal grass cover crops be terminated prior to flowering if lower C:N is desired (Balkcom et al.,
93 2015). However, if weed suppression or soil insulation are desired into the life of the subsequent
94 cash crop, higher C:N can allow cover crop residue to persist longer into the season, since it resists
95 rapid microbial degradation (Decker et al., 2022). This provides a mat of residue to limit weed
96 germination and reduce evaporative losses from bare soil.

97 **Cover Crops and Soil-Water Relationships**

98 Complicating the act of cultivating cover crops in the Southeast is the potential for undesirable
99 soil moisture loss. Evapotranspiration (ET) is one of the primary driving forces behind soil water
100 loss (Katul et al., 2012), and is exacerbated when plants are grown on low water-holding-capacity
101 soils. High temperatures and wind further increase water loss from ET, with these losses causing
102 risks to subsequent cash crops (Messinger et al., 1991). This often necessitates earlier termination
103 of the winter cover crop to allow time for soil moisture to be replenished. However, cool-season
104 winter annual cover crops often pose lessened risk to soil water loss from ET due to the
105 combination of cooler temperatures and more abundant rainfall during winter months (Gates and
106 Hanks, 1967).

107 Past assessment of cover crop water-use under semi-arid conditions has found that presence of
108 cover crops significantly reduces evaporative water losses from bare soil (Bodner et al., 2007).
109 Furthermore, cover crop residues have been demonstrated to insulate soils, allowing for greater
110 moisture retention and overall cooler soil temperatures (Nouri et al., 2019). Conversely, if cereal
111 grass cover crops (wheat and rye) are killed just prior to corn or soybean planting, it can result in
112 less available water for the incoming grain crop (Wagger and Mengel, 1988) due to water uptake
113 occurring just before planting. The practice of mulching, i.e., chemical or mechanical killing of

114 annual grass and legume cover crops without harvesting or reincorporating via tillage, has also
115 been demonstrated to minimize surface water runoff, improve rainfall infiltration, reduce
116 evaporation, and maintain cooler soils later into the growing season (Montenegro et al., 2013).
117 Cooler soil temperatures, however, may result in delayed germination or slower seedling growth
118 for certain cash crops such as cotton. Therefore, the amount of mulched material should be limited
119 or controlled so that summer crop germination is not impeded or delayed.

120 **Benefits to Soil Fertility and Carbon Sequestration**

121 One of the primary benefits of cover crops is reducing soil macronutrient leaching and runoff
122 losses via nutrient cycling (Delgado et al., 2007). This process involves the uptake of nutrients by
123 the cover crop, which then incorporates these nutrients into biomass. The cover crop is then
124 terminated prior to planting of the subsequent cash crop to make nutrients available for seedling
125 corn, beans, or cotton. This is particularly important with labile nutrients such as nitrate (NO_3^-)
126 nitrogen, which is readily leached in heavy rainfall. Cover crops have been shown to significantly
127 reduce nitrate leaching or runoff from soils across the US (Kaspar et al., 2011; Staver et al., 1998;
128 Wyland et al., 1996). Regarding labile soil phosphate (PO_4^{3-}), southeastern soils have generally
129 been oversaturated with phosphorus by decades of repeated livestock manure and poultry litter
130 applications (Novak and Watts, 2004). This makes binding of any excess phosphate difficult and
131 may exacerbate runoff risks into local watersheds. In a fallow system, there is nothing to bind
132 excess soil phosphate, but cover crops can bind readily available excess phosphate (Ye et al.,
133 2020). Past research has found that *Brassicaceae* species (e.g., rapeseed, *Brassica napus* L.)
134 exhibited the greatest uptake of soil phosphorus leachate and the greatest amount of phosphorus
135 in its plant tissue, followed by annual ryegrass (*Lolium multiflorum* Lam.), while red clover
136 (*Trifolium pratense* L.) was the least efficient at binding phosphorus (Miller et al., 1994).

137 Additionally, double cropping of cover crops (i.e., harvesting for grain or forage) can remove large
138 portions of absorbed nutrients from the soil altogether (Blanco-Canqui et al., 2015; Pederson et
139 al., 2002). This can be beneficial in soils saturated with phosphorus and potassium, but problematic
140 when soils have moderate-to-deficient quantities of these macronutrients. If possible, double
141 cropping should be alternated to every-other-year to allow for some return of nutrients to soil by
142 an off-year cover crop.

143 Carbon sequestration is another major benefit of annual cover crops, as they fix carbon from CO_2 ,
144 which can then be returned to soil when the cover crop is terminated. However, this effect is
145 markedly lower in no-tillage and conservation tillage, compared to conventional tillage (Baker et
146 al., 2007). Multiple studies have found that no-tillage or conservation tillage simply changes the
147 distribution of soil organic carbon in the soil profile (i.e., keeping it at shallower depths), but does
148 not increase the amount of total carbon sequestration throughout a soil profile (Tautges et al., 2019;
149 Dolan et al., 2006; Carter, 2005).

150 Alteration of cover cropping strategies may improve carbon sequestration in soil. Recent focus has
151 shifted to converting cropland into perennial forage or range production, as consistent groundcover

152 and root mass aids in buildup of soil organic carbon (O'Rourke et al., 2015). For example, growing
153 the perennial cool-season forage grass tall fescue [*Schedonorus arundinaceus* (Schreb.) Dumort]
154 following 15-years of winter wheat production allowed for a 17% increase in soil organic carbon
155 over the course of 7-years (Carter and Gregorich, 2010). There is also substantial interest from
156 stakeholder organizations and the public for increasing the amount of perennial pastures or grazing
157 areas to increase environmental sustainability and promote healthy crop rotation practices (Follet
158 and Reed, 2010). However, there are reports that perennial forage crops only slowed carbon
159 emissions, but did not increase carbon sequestration (Sanford et al., 2012). These contradictory
160 results were likely due to differing soil properties across regions of the country, but should be
161 further investigated in the southeastern US. With continued discussions of carbon-credits for
162 growers, it may become more critical to advance carbon sequestration by incorporating cover crops
163 into crop rotations to take advantage of potential government economic incentives (Chahal et al.,
164 2020).

165 **Summary and Future Research with Cover Crops**

166 Thus far, this review has covered how cover crops have historically been or are currently being
167 used in the southeastern US. This has focused primarily on a narrow range of annual grass and
168 legume species, along with the benefits that cover crops provide to soil nutrient availability,
169 moisture retention, and carbon sequestration. However, cover cropping is a constantly evolving
170 practice and science. Due to the relatively low regional adoption and diversity of cover crops in
171 the southeastern US, there are several potential research elements that are being or will be
172 examined in the near future. Current USDA-ARS research from Florence, SC is assessing the
173 efficacy and viability of growing cool-season perennial cover crops in tandem with a summer
174 cotton crop to minimize inputs and reduce evaporative losses from soil. Early results suggest that
175 the practice provides substantial weed population and weedy biomass reductions while
176 simultaneously reducing the quantity and frequency of herbicide applications. The perennial
177 species also provide potential biomass for spring beef cattle grazing. Additional collaborative
178 research between ARS and Clemson University is examining carbon sequestration between a
179 conservation tillage system and a 4-species cover crop mixture compared to conventional tillage
180 with and without a cover crop. Diversifying cover crop species and plant families is also of interest,
181 as it promotes different seasonal availability of biomass and may provide greater benefits to soil
182 health and water holding capacity with increasing species density. Findings from these ongoing
183 and future projects will be reported over the next several years.

184 **References**

- 185 Baker, J. M., Ochsner, T. E., Venterea, R. T., & Griffis, T. J. (2007). Tillage and soil carbon
186 sequestration—What do we really know? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*,
187 *118*(1), 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2006.05.014>
- 188 Balkcom, K. S., Duzy, L. M., Kornecki, T. S., & Price, A. J. (2015). Timing of cover crop
189 termination: Management considerations for the Southeast. *Crop, Forage & Turfgrass*
190 *Management*, *1*(1), cftm2015.0161. <https://doi.org/10.2134/cftm2015.0161>

- 191 Baraibar, B., Hunter, M. C., Schipanski, M. E., Hamilton, A., & Mortensen, D. A. (2018). Weed
192 suppression in cover crop monocultures and mixtures. *Weed Science*, 66(1), 121-133.
193 <https://doi.org/10.1017/wsc.2017.59>
- 194 Blanco-Canqui, H., Shaver, T. M., Lindquist, J. L., Shapiro, C. A., Elmore, R. W., Francis, C.
195 A., & Hergert, G. W. (2015). Cover crops and ecosystem services: Insights from studies
196 in temperate soils. *Agronomy Journal*, 107(6), 2449-2474.
197 <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj15.0086>
- 198 Bodner, G., Loiskandl, W., & Kaul, H. P. (2007). Cover crop evapotranspiration under semi-arid
199 conditions using FAO dual crop coefficient method with water stress compensation.
200 *Agricultural Water Management*, 93(3), 85-98.
201 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2007.06.010>
- 202 Bybee-Finley, K. A., Mirsky, S. B., & Ryan, M. R. (2017). Crop biomass not species richness
203 drives weed suppression in warm-season annual grass-legume intercrops in the
204 Northeast. *Weed Science*, 65(5), 669-680, 612. <https://doi.org/10.1017/wsc.2017.25>
- 205 Carter, M. R. (2005). Long-term tillage effects on cool-season soybean in rotation with barley,
206 soil properties and carbon and nitrogen storage for fine sandy loams in the humid climate
207 of Atlantic Canada. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 81(1), 109-120.
208 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2004.05.002>
- 209 Carter, M. R., & Gregorich, E. G. (2010). Carbon and nitrogen storage by deep-rooted tall fescue
210 (*Lolium arundinaceum*) in the surface and subsurface soil of a fine sandy loam in eastern
211 Canada. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 136(1), 125-132.
212 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2009.12.005>
- 213 Chahal, I., Vyn, R. J., Mayers, D., & Van Eerd, L. L. (2020). Cumulative impact of cover crops
214 on soil carbon sequestration and profitability in a temperate humid climate. *Scientific*
215 *Reports*, 10(1), 13381. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-70224-6>
- 216 Decker, H. L., Gamble, A. V., Balkcom, K. S., Johnson, A. M., & Hull, N. R. (2022). Cover crop
217 monocultures and mixtures affect soil health indicators and crop yield in the southeast
218 United States. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 86(5), 1312-1326.
219 <https://doi.org/10.1002/saj2.20454>
- 220 DeLaune, P. B., Mubvumba, P., Lewis, K. L., & Keeling, J. W. (2019). Rye cover crop impacts
221 soil properties in a long-term cotton system. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*,
222 83(5), 1451-1458. <https://doi.org/10.2136/sssaj2019.03.0069>
- 223 Delgado, J. A., Dillon, M. A., Sparks, R. T., & Essah, S. Y. C. (2007). A decade of advances in
224 cover crops. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 62(5), 110A-117A.
225 <http://www.jswnonline.org/content/62/5/110A.abstract>
- 226 Dolan, M. S., Clapp, C. E., Allmaras, R. R., Baker, J. M., & Molina, J. A. E. (2006). Soil organic
227 carbon and nitrogen in a Minnesota soil as related to tillage, residue and nitrogen
228 management. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 89(2), 221-231.
229 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2005.07.015>
- 230 Elsalahy, H., Döring, T., Bellingrath-Kimura, S., & Arends, D. (2019). Weed suppression in
231 only-legume cover crop mixtures. *Agronomy*, 9(10), 648. <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4395/9/10/648>
- 232
233 Follett, R. F., & Reed, D. A. (2010). Soil carbon sequestration in grazing lands: societal benefits
234 and policy implications. *Rangeland Ecology & Management*, 63(1), 4-15.
235 <https://doi.org/10.2111/08-225.1>

- 236 Frasier, I., Quiroga, A., & Noellemeyer, E. (2016). Effect of different cover crops on C and N
237 cycling in sorghum NT systems. *Science of The Total Environment*, 562, 628-639.
238 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2016.04.058>
- 239 Gates, D. M., & Hanks, R. J. (1967). Plant factors affecting evapotranspiration. In R.M. Hagan,
240 H.R. Haise and T.W. Edminster (eds.), *Irrigation of Agricultural Lands* (pp. 506-521).
241 <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronmonogr11.c28>
- 242 Jacobs, A. A., Evans, R. S., Allison, J. K., Garner, E. R., Kingery, W. L., & McCulley, R. L.
243 (2022). Cover crops and no-tillage reduce crop production costs and soil loss,
244 compensating for lack of short-term soil quality improvement in a maize and soybean
245 production system. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 218, 105310.
246 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.still.2021.105310>
- 247 Kaspar, T. C., & Singer, J. W. (2011). The use of cover crops to manage soil. In *Soil*
248 *Management: Building a Stable Base for Agriculture* (pp. 321-337).
249 <https://doi.org/10.2136/2011.soilmanagement.c21>
- 250 Katul, G. G., Oren, R., Manzoni, S., Higgins, C., & Parlange, M. B. (2012). Evapotranspiration:
251 A process driving mass transport and energy exchange in the soil-plant-atmosphere-
252 climate system. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 50(3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011RG000366>
- 253 Raper, R. L., Reeves, D. W., Burmester, C. H., & Schwab E. B. (2000). Tillage depth, tillage
254 timing, and cover crop effects on cotton yield, soil strength, and tillage energy
255 requirements. *Applied Engineering in Agriculture*, 16(4), 379-385.
256 <https://doi.org/10.13031/2013.5363>
- 257 Lewis, K. L., Burke, J. A., Keeling, W. S., McCallister, D. M., DeLaune, P. B., & Keeling, J. W.
258 (2018). Soil benefits and yield limitations of cover crop use in Texas high plains cotton.
259 *Agronomy Journal*, 110(4), 1616-1623. <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2018.02.0092>
- 260 Meisinger, J., Hargrove, W., Mikkelsen, R., Williams, J., & Benson, V. (1991). Effects of cover
261 crops on groundwater quality. In W. L. Hargrove (ed.), *Cover crops for clean water*, 57-
262 68.
- 263 Miller, M. H., Beauchamp, E. G., & Lauzon, J. D. (1994). Leaching of nitrogen and phosphorus
264 from the biomass of three cover crop species. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 23(2),
265 267-272. <https://doi.org/10.2134/jeq1994.00472425002300020007x>
- 266 Mirsky, S. B., Ryan, M. R., Curran, W. S., Teasdale, J. R., Maul, J., Spargo, J. T., Moyer, J.,
267 Grantham, A. M., Weber, D., Way, T. R., & Camargo, G. G. (2012). Conservation tillage
268 issues: Cover crop-based organic rotational no-till grain production in the mid-Atlantic
269 region, USA. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 27(1), 31-40.
270 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170511000457>
- 271 Montenegro, A. A. A., Abrantes, J. R. C. B., de Lima, J. L. M. P., Singh, V. P., & Santos, T. E.
272 M. (2013). Impact of mulching on soil and water dynamics under intermittent simulated
273 rainfall. *CATENA*, 109, 139-149. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2013.03.018>
- 274 Nouri, A., Lee, J., Yin, X., Tyler, D. D., & Saxton, A. M. (2019). Thirty-four years of no-tillage
275 and cover crops improve soil quality and increase cotton yield in Alfisols, Southeastern
276 USA. *Geoderma*, 337, 998-1008. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2018.10.016>
- 277 Novak, J., & Watts, D. (2004). Increasing the phosphorus sorption capacity of southeastern
278 Coastal Plain soils using water treatment residuals. *Soil Science*, 169(3), 206-214.
279 <https://doi.org/10.1097/01.ss.0000122522.03492.30>

- 280 Novak, J. M., Watts, D. W., Bauer, P. J., Karlen, D. L., Hunt, P. G., & Mishra, U. (2020). Loamy
281 sand soil approaches organic carbon saturation after 37 years of conservation tillage.
282 *Agronomy Journal*, 112(4), 3152-3162. <https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20184>
- 283 O'Rourke, S. M., Angers, D. A., Holden, N. M., & McBratney, A. B. (2015). Soil organic carbon
284 across scales. *Global Change Biology*, 21(10), 3561-3574.
285 <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.12959>
- 286 Pederson, G. A., Brink, G. E., & Fairbrother, T. E. (2002). Nutrient uptake in plant parts of
287 sixteen forages fertilized with poultry litter. *Agronomy Journal*, 94(4), 895-904.
288 <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2002.8950>
- 289 Roesch-McNally, G. E., Basche, A. D., Arbuckle, J. G., Tyndall, J. C., Miguez, F. E., Bowman,
290 T., & Clay, R. (2018). The trouble with cover crops: Farmers' experiences with
291 overcoming barriers to adoption. *Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems*, 33(4), 322-
292 333. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742170517000096>
- 293 Sanford, G. R., Posner, J. L., Jackson, R. D., Kucharik, C. J., Hedtcke, J. L., & Lin, T.-L. (2012).
294 Soil carbon lost from Mollisols of the North Central U.S.A. with 20 years of agricultural
295 best management practices. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 162, 68-76.
296 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2012.08.011>
- 297 Staver, K. W., & Brinsfield, R. B. (1998). Using cereal grain winter cover crops to reduce
298 groundwater nitrate contamination in the mid-Atlantic coastal plain. *Journal of Soil and*
299 *Water Conservation*, 53(3), 230. <http://www.jswconline.org/content/53/3/230.abstract>
- 300 Tahir, S., & Marschner, P. (2017). Clay addition to sandy soil—influence of clay type and size
301 on nutrient availability in sandy soils amended with residues differing in C/N ratio.
302 *Pedosphere*, 27(2), 293-305. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160\(17\)60317-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1002-0160(17)60317-5)
- 303 Tautges, N. E., Chiartas, J. L., Gaudin, A. C. M., O'Geen, A. T., Herrera, I., & Scow, K. M.
304 (2019). Deep soil inventories reveal that impacts of cover crops and compost on soil
305 carbon sequestration differ in surface and subsurface soils. *Global Change Biology*,
306 25(11), 3753-3766. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.14762>
- 307 Tracy, B. F., Renne, I. J., Gerrish, J., & Sanderson, M. A. (2004). Effects of plant diversity on
308 invasion of weed species in experimental pasture communities. *Basic and Applied*
309 *Ecology*, 5(6), 543-550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.baae.2004.08.007>
- 310 Trimble, S. W. (1974). *Man-induced soil erosion of the southern piedmont: 1700 - 1970*. Soil
311 Conservation Society of America. Akeny, IA.
- 312 Vann, R. A., Reberg-Horton, S. C., Castillo, M. S., McGee, R. J., & Mirsky, S. B. (2019). Winter
313 pea, crimson clover, and hairy vetch planted in mixture with small grains in the southeast
314 United States. *Agronomy Journal*, 111(2), 805-815.
315 <https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj2018.03.0202>
- 316 Wagger, M. G., & Mengel, D. B. (1988). The role of nonleguminous cover crops in the efficient
317 use of water and nitrogen. In W. L. Hargrove (ed.), *Cropping Strategies for Efficient Use*
318 *of Water and Nitrogen* (pp. 115-127). <https://doi.org/10.2134/asaspecpub51.c7>
- 319 Wyland, L. J., Jackson, L. E., Chaney, W. E., Klonsky, K., Koike, S. T., & Kimple, B. (1996).
320 Winter cover crops in a vegetable cropping system: Impacts on nitrate leaching, soil
321 water, crop yield, pests and management costs. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*,
322 59(1), 1-17. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8809\(96\)01048-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-8809(96)01048-1)
- 323 Ye, R., Parajuli, B., Ducey, T. F., Novak, J. M., Bauer, P. J., & Szogi, A. A. (2020). Cover
324 cropping increased phosphorus stocks in surface sandy ultisols under long-term

325 conservation and conventional tillage. *Agronomy Journal*, 112(4), 3163-3173.
326 <https://doi.org/10.1002/agj2.20227>

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

