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## Introduction

The Texas A\&M University System purchased 373 acres of farmland from the estate of Ardella Helm in December, 1999, for the sole purpose of conducting large scale research and extension programs to enhance producer profitability and sustainability in an irrigated environment. The farm is located 2 miles south of the Texas AgriLife Research and Extension Center at Halfway in Hale County.

Current projects at the Helm Research Farm involve production options and economics of subsurface drip irrigation (SDI). Other research projects include weed and insect control, plant breeding and yield trials for several commodities and production systems projects. Irrigated experiments were conducted under the 130 acre center pivot and on 86 -acres of SDI.

The soils are predominantly deep clay loams and silty clay loams, with $0-1 \%$ and $1-3 \%$ slopes, moderately to moderately slowly permeable subsoils and high water and fertility holding capacities. Supplemental water for irrigation comes from five wells, 320 to 340 feet deep, pumping at rates of 300 to 400 gallons per minute each.


Large plot irrigated grain sorghum study conducted on 130 acres equipped with a center pivot at Helm Research Farm, Halfway, TX.

Cotton is harvested with a modified John Deere 7445 stripper at Helm Research Farm, Halfway, TX. Bulk seed cotton weights and fiber data sub-samples are obtained from SDI treatments.


## Subsurface Drip Irrigation Pre-plant Irrigation Timing Effects on Germination and Cotton Yield

 (Field 2).James Bordovsky and Joe Mustian
Objective: To determine the effects on cotton lint yield of three pre-plant irrigation sequences using SDI.
Methodology: Plot size was 8 rows by 1300 ' with three replications. Treatment factors were pre-plant irrigation sequence and depth of planting. SDI laterals were spaced at 60 inches. Crop rows were spaced 30 inches apart with two rows planted on single 60 inch beds. All tillage and seedbed shaping occurred immediately following the previous year's harvest, therefore, the seedbeds were undisturbed from December until cotton planting in May. Three irrigation sequences were replicated ( 3 x ) in a complete randomized block design and are depicted graphically in Figure 1.


Figure 2. Subsurface drip irrigated cotton germination test plot. This picture was taken on July 6 during the record drought of 2011 at the Helms Research Farm.

Table 1. Yield and seasonal irrigation water use efficiency resulting from three pre-plant irrigation sequences, 20112012.

|  | Treatment | Year |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: |
|  |  | 2011 | 2012 |
| Yield (lb/ac) | T1 | 902 a | 1056 a |
|  | T2 | 1021 a | 1113 a |
|  | T3 | 584 b | 1156 a |
|  |  |  |  |
| SIWUE (lb/ac-in) | T1 | 61.7 a | 75.4 a |
|  | T2 | 70.3 a | 81.2 a |
|  | T3 | 32.6 b | 84.8 a |

# Cotton Response to Irrigation Interval using Subsurface Drip Irrigation (Field 3) 

James P. Bordovsky, Joe Mustian, David Winters and Casey Hardin
Objective: To determine SDI cotton yield response to irrigation intervals of 0.25 -, 1 or 2-, and 7 -days at two irrigation levels in a field with slopes common to the Texas South Plains.

Methodology: Two irrigation levels and three irrigation intervals were used to determine the effects of these parameters on cotton irrigated with subsurface drip irrigation from 2009 to 2012. The high irrigation level met $\sim 80 \%$ of crop water needs using ET scheduling, low level irrigations were $50 \%$ of the high. Irrigation intervals were every 6 hours or $0.25-\mathrm{d}$, either 1 or 2-d, and 7 -d. The intermediate irrigation interval was changed from 2 to 1 day in 2010 and in subsequent years. Six 8 -row x 1300 ft treatment plots were established in each of four blocks within a field characterized by decreasing elevations from SW to NE, with rows oriented N-S. Cotton was planted by mid May in each year at $\sim 54,000 \mathrm{ppa}$ on 30 -in rows. Lint yield was determined by harvesting 4 rows using a conventional cotton stripper (figure 1) and adjusting seed cotton weights from each plot using lint turnout percentages from multiple 1 to 2 lb sub-samples from each replicate. Irrigation quantities were approximately the same for all treatments within an irrigation level. Additional details are given in the appendix.


Figure 1. Cotton harvest from plots of the SDI irrigation interval study, 2009-2012.
0.25 - to 7 days. Seasonal irrigation productivity was determined by subtracting yield of non-seasonally irrigated plots (dryland) from yields of irrigated plots and dividing that quantity by seasonal irrigation depth. WUE increased from 93.5 to $100.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$-inch (low irrigation) and from 67.8 to $82.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}-$ in (high irrigation) as irrigation intervals increased from 0.25 to 7 days. Loan values were also significantly higher at irrigation intervals of 7 days compared to those of 0.25 days at both low and high irrigation levels. It is hypothesized that by irrigating less frequently, the soil profile is wetted deeper and wider during each irrigation event. This should increase rooting volume and providing increased opportunity for cotton plants to utilize available water and nutrients from the larger volume of soil. Differences due to irrigation interval were more pronounced during the dry summers of 2011 and 2012 (data not shown) than during the summers of 2009 and 2010.

Results: The four-year average cotton lint yield, seasonal water productivity and loan values increase as irrigation intervals increase at both the low and high irrigation levels (figure 2). At the low irrigation level, average yield increased from 1095 to $1136 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ and at high irrigation, yields increased significantly from 1327 to $1539 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ when irrigation intervals increased from every


Figure 2. Average yield, seasonal irrigation water use efficiency, and cotton lint loan values from the SDI irrigation interval study, 2009-2012.

## Bayer Cotton Agronomic Performance Trial (Field 5a)

Wayne Keeling, Jacob Reed, Justin Spradley, and Daniel Olivier
Objective: The objective was to compare yield, fiber quality, and gross revenue as a function of five Bayer CropScience varieties and water levels.

Methodology: Irrigations were at a base irrigation level (M), 1.5 x base irrigation level (H), and 0.5 x base irrigation level (L). See appendix for additional agronomic details.

Results: When averaged across irrigation levels, highest yields were produced with FM 2484 B2F and FM 9170 B2F. When averaged across varieties, yields ranged from 655 to 1598 lbs./A. Compared to the base irrigation treatment, yields were reduced $51 \%$ at the low irrigation level and increased only $19 \%$ at the high irrigation level. When averaged across irrigation level, lint values were similar for all varieties but were reduced with the high irrigation treatment. When averaged across varieties, gross revenues were reduced $51 \%$ with the low irrigation level and increased only $7 \%$ with the high irrigation level. When averaged across irrigation levels, highest gross revenues were produced with FM 2484 B2F and FM 9170 B2F.

Table 1. Effects of B2RF variety and LEPA irrigation levels on cotton lint yields at Helms Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | Low | Medium | High | Irrig. Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | lbs/A |  |  |
| FM 9170B2F | 698 a | 1361 a | 1654 ab | 1238 AB |
| FM 1944GLB2 | 591 a | 1258 a | 1486 b | 1111 C |
| FM 9250GL | 632 a | 1318 a | 1579 ab | 1176 BC |
| FM 2484B2F | 697 a | 1402 a | 1869 a | 1321 A |
| FM 2011GT | 657 a | 1394 a | 1406 b | 1153 BC |
| Avg. <br> \% change | $\begin{gathered} \hline 655 \mathrm{C} \\ (-51 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1347 \text { B } \\ (-----) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1598 \mathrm{~A} \\ & (+19 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Table 2. Effects of B2RF variety and LEPA irrigation levels on lint value at Helms Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | Low | Medium | High | Irrig. Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| FM 9170B2F | 56.17 b | 56.63 a | 51.77 a | 54.87 A |
| FM 1944GLB2 | 56.25 ab | 55.98 a | 50.42 a | 54.19 A |
| FM 9250GL | 56.45 ab | 55.77 a | 48.38 a | 53.58 A |
| FM 2484B2F | 57.22 a | 56.62 a | 50.43 a | 54.74 A |
| FM 2011GT | 56.70 ab | 55.73 a | 51.53 a | 54.63 A |
| Avg. | 56.54 A | 56.15 A | 50.52 B |  |

Table 3. Effects of B2RF variety and LEPA irrigation levels on gross revenues at Helms Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | Low | Medium | High | Irrig. Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | --\$/A |  |  |
| FM 9170B2F | 392 a | 772 a | 856 ab | 673 AB |
| FM 1944GLB2 | 349 a | 704 a | 749 ab | 600 B |
| FM 9250GL | 357 a | 735 a | 764 ab | 619 B |
| FM 2484B2F | 399 a | 793 a | 948 a | 712 A |
| FM 2011GT | 372 a | 777 a | 724 b | 626 B |
| Avg. | 373 B | 756 A | 808 A |  |
| \% change | (-51\%) | (-----) | (+7) |  |

# The Influence of Crop Rotation, Irrigation Rate, and Variety on Verticillium Wilt and Cotton Yield 

 from 2007 - 2012 (Field 5b,c,d,e).Terry Wheeler, Jim Bordovsky, and Wayne Keeling
Objective: To determine the influence of various management tools (crop rotation, irrigation rate, and variety) on severity of Verticillium wilt, population density of Verticillium dahliae, and yield.

Methodology: Three pies (B, C, D) of the Helms circle were in a 2 year-cotton/1 year-grain (primarily sorghum) from 2001-2012. One pie (E) was in continuous cotton over this time period. Three irrigation rates (Base (B), B+50\% and B-50\%) were used, where from 2007-2009, the Base rate was designed to match $80 \%$ of the evapotranspiration rate (ET) and from $2010-2012$, the Base rate was designed to match $60 \%$ of ET, when pumping capacity was sufficient. In $2007-2009$, the susceptible variety to Verticillium wilt was Stoneville 4554B2F and the partially resistant variety for two of those years was Deltapine (DP) 104B2RF. From 2010-2012, the susceptible variety to Verticillium wilt was DP 0912B2RF and the partially resistant variety was Fibermax 9180B2F. Soil samples were taken in January to monitor population density of $V$. dahliae spores (microsclerotia), and incidence of wilt was determined around $20^{\text {th }}$ of August each year from 2008-2012. Yield was harvested from these large plots each year.

Results: The microsclerotia of the fungus generally increased over time, but at a much faster rate in the continuous cotton and higher irrigation rates (Fig. 1A). Incidence of wilt was highest in 2010 when the weather was especially conducive for disease (cool and wet in July) and has been much higher for the continuous cotton and B+50\% irrigation rate than for the Base or B$50 \%$ irrigation rates and rotated cotton in all years (Fig. 1B). For


Figure 1. Effect of continuous cotton (CC) or cotton rotated with sorghum (Rot) and irrigation rate (Base, Low $=$ Base- $50 \%$, High=Base $+50 \%$ ) on density of Verticillium dahliae microsclerotia/cm3 soil and Verticillium wilt incidence over time. cotton watered with the Base $+50 \%$ irrigation rate (Fig. 2A), yields have been highest every year for the rotated cotton that was planted to a variety that was partially resistant to Verticillium wilt. The combination of rotated cotton and a susceptible variety, or continuous cotton and a partially resistant variety had intermediate yields at the Base $+50 \%$ irrigation rate over the six years; and the worse yields in 2008-2010, and 2012 were with the combination of continuous cotton and a susceptible variety at the Base $+50 \%$ irrigation rate. When cotton was irrigated with the Base irrigation rate (Fig. 2B), then using crop rotation resulted in the best cotton yields in all years except for 2011. The benefit of a partially resistant variety resulted in higher yields about $1 / 2$ of the time if the land was rotated to sorghum once every 3 years. Generally yields were lower with continuous cotton compared to rotated cotton, and using a partially resistant variety resulted in much higher yields than a susceptible variety in 2 of the 6 years, or similar yields in 3 of 6 years. Since very little Verticillium wilt occurred at the Base50\% irrigation rate, data from these years are not presented.



Figure 2. The effect of crop rotation (Rot = rotated cotton, $\mathrm{CC}=$ continuous cotton) and partially resistant ( R ) or susceptible ( S ) varieties to Verticillium wilt.

Cotton Variety Performance as Affected by Low-Energy Precision Application (LEPA) Irrigation Levels in a 3-year rotation following cotton (2011) and grain sorghum (2010) (Field 5b)
Wayne Keeling, Jim Bordovsky, Jacob Reed, Justin Spradley and Justin Cave
Objective: The objective was to compare yield, fiber quality, and gross revenue as a function of popular cotton varieties and water levels in a three-year crop rotation with this year's cotton following cotton.

Methodology: Irrigations were at a base irrigation level (M), $1.5 \times$ base irrigation level (H), and $0.5 \times$ base irrigation level (L). See appendix for additional agronomic details.

Results: The results are contained in the following tables.

Table 1. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on cotton lint yields at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 558 a | 1380 a | 1340 a | 1092 A |
| FM 9180B2F | 450 b | 1087 a | 1337 a | 958 A |
| NG 3348B2RF | 441 b | 1205 a | 1201 a | 949 A |
| ST 4288B2RF | 609 a | 1113 a | 1572 a | 1098 A |
| Avg. <br> \% change | $\begin{gathered} 514 \mathrm{~B} \\ (-57 \%) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1196 \mathrm{~A} \\ & (-) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1362 \mathrm{~A} \\ (+12 \%) \end{gathered}$ |  |

Table 2. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on lint value at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 55.83 a | 54.24 b | 51.53 a | 53.87 B |
| FM 9180B2F | 55.12 a | 57.50 a | 52.92 a | 55.18 AB |
| NG 3348B2RF | 54.27 a | 55.84 ab | 52.08 a | 54.06 B |
| ST 4288B2RF | 56.48 a | 57.03 a | 54.03 a | 55.85 A |
| Avg. | 55.42 A | 56.15 A | 52.64 B |  |

Table 3. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on gross revenues at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 311 a | 705 a | 691 a | 584 A |
| FM 9180B2F | 249 b | 625 a | 707 a | 527 A |
| NG 3348B2RF | 239 b | 669 a | 625 a | 511 A |
| ST 4288B2RF | 344 a | 365 a | 837 a | 605 A |
| Avg. \% change | $\begin{aligned} & 286 \mathrm{~B} \\ & (-57 \%) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 670A } \\ & (\stackrel{\square}{\square}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 715 \mathrm{~A} \\ & (+6 \%) \end{aligned}$ |  |

Cotton Variety Performance as Affected by Low-Energy Precision Application (LEPA) Irrigation Levels in a 3-year rotation following sorghum (2011) and cotton (2010) (Field 5d).
Wayne Keeling, Jim Bordovsky, Jacob Reed, Justin Spradley and Justin Cave
Objective: The objective was to compare yield, fiber quality, and gross revenue as a function of popular cotton varieties and water levels in a three-year crop rotation with this year's cotton following sorghum.

Methodology: Irrigations were at a base irrigation level (M), $1.5 \times$ base irrigation level (H), and $0.5 \times$ base irrigation level (L). See appendix for additional agronomic details.

Results: The results are contained in the following tables.

Table 1. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on cotton lint yields at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 556 ab | 1174 ab | 1164 b | 965 BC |
| FM 9180B2F | 468 b | 1199 ab | 1349 a | 1005 B |
| NG 3348B2RF | 442 b | 1082 b | 1239 ab | 921 C |
| ST 4288B2RF | 657 a | 1279 a | 1323 a | 1086 A |
| Avg. | 531 C | 1183 B | 1269 A |  |
| \% change | (-55\%) | (-) | (+7\%) |  |

Table 2. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on lint value at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 54.26 a | 53.84 b | 52.69 ab | 53.60 B |
| FM 9180B2F | 55.51 a | 57.28 a | 54.43 ab | 55.74 A |
| NG 3348B2RF | 53.90 a | 55.79 a | 52.08 b | 53.92 B |
| ST 4288B2RF | 54.59 a | 57.23 a | 56.73 a | 56.18 A |
| Avg. | 54.57 AB | 56.03 A | 53.98 B |  |

Table 3. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on gross revenues at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 300 ab | 632 b | 615 b | 516 C |
| FM 9180B2F | 261 b | 687 ab | 735 a | 561 B |
| NG 3348B2RF | 239 b | 604 b | 642 b | 495 C |
| ST 4288B2RF | 359 a | 732 a | 751 a | 614 A |
| Avg. | 290 B | 664 A | 686 A |  |
| \% change | (-56\%) | (-) | (+3\%) |  |

## Continuous Cotton Variety Performance as Affected by Low-Energy Precision Application (LEPA) Irrigation Levels (Field 5e)

Wayne Keeling, Jim Bordovsky, Jacob Reed, Justin Spradley and Justin Cave
Objective: The objective was to compare yield, fiber quality, and gross revenue as a function of popular cotton varieties and water levels in a cotton monoculture.

Methodology: Irrigations were at a base irrigation level (M), 1.5 x base irrigation level (H), and 0.5 x base irrigation level (L). See appendix for additional agronomic details.

Results: The results are contained in the following tables.

Table 1. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on cotton lint yields at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DP 0912B2RF | 536 a | 1058 a | $\mathrm{lbs} / \mathrm{A}$ | 1005 b |
| FM 9180B2F | 437 a | 997 a | 866 B |  |
| NG 3348B2RF | 443 a | 997 a | 1205 a | 880 AB |
| ST 4288B2RF | 537 a | 1079 a | 1137 ab | 859 B |
| Avg. | 488 C | 1033 B | 1254 a | 956 A |
| $\%$ change | $(-53 \%)$ | $(----)$ | $(+10 \%)$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on lint value at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\phi / \mathrm{lb}$ |  |
| DP 0912B2RF | 54.14 a | 55.44 a | 51.33 b | 53.63 BC |
| FM 9180B2F | 55.25 a | 57.01 a | 52.73 ab | 55.00 AB |
| NG 3348B2RF | 54.20 a | 55.90 a | 49.18 b | 53.09 C |
| ST 4288B2RF | 55.10 a | 56.16 a | 55.34 a | 55.53 A |
| Avg. | 54.67 A | 56.13 A | 52.14 B |  |

Table 3. Effects of cotton variety and LEPA irrigation levels on gross revenues at Helm Farm, Halfway, TX, 2012.

| Variety | L | M | H | Avg. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\$ / A$ |  |
| DP 0912B2RF | 291 a | 588 a | 518 c | 465 B |
| FM 9180B2F | 243 a | 569 a | 636 ab | 482 AB |
| NG 3348B2RF | 241 a | 558 a | 560 bc | 453 B |
| ST 4288B2RF | 296 a | 606 a | 694 a | 432 A |
| Avg. | 268 B | 580 A | 602 A |  |
| \% change | $(-54 \%)$ | $(----)$ | $(+4 \%)$ |  |

Effects of Subsurface Drip Irrigation (SDI) Level, Nitrogen Rate and Harvest Method on Cotton Yield and Fiber Quality (Field 6a-f).<br>Wayne Keeling, James Bordovsky, Eric Hequet, and John Wanjura

Objective: To determine the effects on cotton production, particularly fiber quality, of excess nitrogen, harvest method, and variety at two irrigation levels.


Methodology: Plot size was 8 rows by 1600 ' with three replications. Treatment factors were irrigation level, cotton variety, nitrogen level and harvest method. Excess nitrogen was applied in appropriate plots prior to planting with the remainder applied during seasonal irrigations. Previous tests have indicated excess nitrogen lowered fiber quality. All treatments were irrigated with SDI. The High water level was irrigated at $100 \%$ ET, the Low level at $50 \%$ of the High. Four rows from each plot were harvested by either cotton picker (Oct 31) or stripper (Nov 8) with 200-lb samples to be analyzed at the Fiber and Biopolymer Research Lab at Texas Tech. Detailed agronomic information is contained in the appendix.

| Table 1. Effects of SDI Irrigation level, nitrogen rate, and harvest method on cotton lint yield |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variety | Irrigation Level | Nitrogen Level (1b/A) |  | ) Yield ( $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{A}$ )(\% turnout) |  | Lint Value (cents/LB) |  | Gross Return (\$/A) |  |
| DP 0912B2RF |  |  |  | Harvest Method |  | Harvest Method |  | Harvest Method |  |
|  |  |  |  | Picker | Stripper | Picker | Stripper | Picker | Stripper |
|  | Low Irrigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | High N | 147 | 820a (.379) | 985a (.368) | 52.17c | 53.68a | 428a | 529a |
|  |  | Low N | 60 | 986a (.388) | 1029a (.366) | 53.70bc | 52.90a | 530a | 544a |
|  | High Irrigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | High N | 153 | 1161a (.372) | 1232a (.349) | 56.52a | 56.65a | 669a | 697a |
|  |  | Low N | 82 | 1129a (.378) | 1158a (.349) | 55.15ab | 56.80a | 612a | 657a |
|  |  | Average |  | 1024 A (.379) A | 1101 A (.358)B | 54.39A | 55.01A | 559A | 606A |
| FM 9180 B2F | Low Irrigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | High N | 147 | 837b (.367) | 888b (.345) | 56.83a | 56.77a | 476b | 504b |
|  |  | Low N | 60 | 839b (.367) | 897b (.343) | 56.83a | 56.27a | 477b | 504b |
|  | High Irrigation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | High N | 153 | 1155a (.363) | 1266a (.333) | 57.27a | 57.28a | 661a | 725a |
|  |  | Low N | 82 | 1147a (.362) | 1245a (.333) | 57.33a | 57.18a | 658a | 712a |
|  |  | Average |  | $944 \mathrm{~A}(.364) \mathrm{A}$ | 1074A (.338)B | 57.06A | 56.88A | 568A | 611A |

## RESULTS:

Yields produced with DP 0912B2RF were not affected by irrigation or nitrogen level within a harvesting method, but overall yields trended higher with stripper harvesting (Table 1). Lint values were similar for both harvesting methods, while irrigation and nitrogen levels did influence quality within the picker harvested plots. Irrigation level, nitrogen level or harvesting method did not affect gross return for DP 0912B2RF. Irrigation levels increased yields for FM 9180B2F within both harvesting methods, and overall yields were higher with stripper harvesting. Irrigation level, nitrogen level, or harvesting method did not affect lint value for FM 9180B2F, but gross returns were increased with the high irrigation treatment. Percent lint turnout was increased with picker harvest for both varieties.

## Comparison of Cotton Yield and Water Productivity Among SDI Fields with Different Lateral/Row Configurations (Fields 2, 3 and 6h).

James P. Bordovsky, Joe Mustian, David Winters, and Casey Hardin
Objective: To make general comparisons of germination and cotton yield resulting from SDI system/plant position strategies.

Methodology: Seed germination has been a major issue when irrigating with SDI, particularly in years with little rain during the planting period. Cotton was drip irrigated in three separate field experiments in 2011 and treatments were arranged in one replicated field in 2012. The "traditional" drip installation provided one drip lateral in alternate crop furrows. The "shallow" drip treatments had SDI laterals placed 8 inches below the level soil surface in an alternate furrow pattern. A "skip-row" planting pattern with cotton planted directly over the SDI laterals to increase the probability of seed germination was attempted in a June 14, 2011 planting, and was used as a replicated treatment in 2012. The 2012 test determined yield and water productivity of skip row versus traditional plantings with cotton planted at an optimum time.

Results: Yield and water productivity data is given in Table1. In 2011, the late planted skip row treatment resulted in a low, but very acceptable yield of $900 \mathrm{lb} /$ acre compared to the yield from a test area where traditional SDI plantings resulted in poor cotton germination, poor plant stand, and yield of $859 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. Seasonal irrigation water use efficiency favored the skip row treatment in this excessively hot, dry growing season. In 2012, cotton was planted on May 3 with marginal soil water in the planted rows of the "traditional" plots and adequate soil water in rows of the "skip row" plantings. Rain events on May 10 and May 13 assisted in providing reasonable germination in the "traditional" treatments (figure 1). In 2012, the "traditional" treatment resulted in significantly higher lint yield (1957 vs. $1547 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ ), seasonal irrigation water use efficiency ( 135 vs . $103 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{in}$ ), and total irrigation use efficiency ( 95 vs .75 $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}-\mathrm{in}$ ) than the skip row treatments. Future experiments will evaluate these treatments with planting date as a second factor.


Figure 1. "Skip-row drip" with 60 -inch lateral spacing and 60 -inch cotton rows planted directly above laterals (bottom) and "traditionally planted" cotton with 60 -inch SDI laterals in alternate furrows between 30 -in crop rows (top).

Table 1 Yield and water productivity data from subsurface drip irrigated cotton tests planted in different configurations, 2011-2012.

|  | 2011 |  |  | 2012* |  | Average of 2011 \& 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Traditionial Drip | Shallow Drip | Skip Row Drip | Traditionial Drip | Skip Row Drip | Traditionial Drip | Skip Row Drip |
| Planting Date | 5/13/2011 | 5/13/2011 | 6/14/2011 | 5/3/2012 | 5/3/2012 |  |  |
| Pre \& At Plant Irrigation (in) | 8.6 | 7.3 | 13.7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 7.8 | 10.4 |
| Seasonal Irrigation (in) | 10.8 | 15.4 | 9.3 | 13.1 | 13.1 | 11.9 | 11.2 |
| Yield (lb/ac) | 859 | 1540 | 900 | 1957 | 1547 | 1408 | 1224 |
| Seasonal Irrigation WUE (lb/ac-in) | 58 | 85 | 72 | 135 | 103 | 97 | 88 |
| Total Irrigation Use Efficiency (lb/ac-in) | 44 | 68 | 39 | 95 | 75 | 70 | 57 |

[^0]Effect of Nitrogen Fertilizer on Cotton Host-plant Quality and Its Impact on Arthropod Activity (Field 6g).<br>M.N. Parajulee, S.C. Carroll, R.B. Shrestha, J.P. Bordovsky

Objective: The objective was to evaluate the effect of nitrogen fertilizer application rates on the population dynamics of cotton arthropods, plant growth parameters, and lint yield.

Methodology: A high-yielding FiberMax cultivar, FM 9063B2R, was planted at a targeted rate of 56,000 seeds/acre on May 17, 2012. The experiment consisted of a randomized block design with five treatments and five replications. Pre-treatment soil samples (consisting of three soil cores; 0 to 24 -inch depth), were collected from each of the 25 experiment plots on June 1, 2012. The five side-dress N fertilizer application treatments at rates of $0,50,100,150$, and 200 lb N/acre were applied on July 6, 2012. Crop growth and insect activity were monitored during the crop season. Weekly during most of July and August, numerous plant variables were measured to evaluate the influence of residual soil nitrogen on early plant growth patterns. Examples of collected plant data variables included: 1) plant biomass weight, 2) plant height, 3) total leaf area, 4) percent leaf nitrogen, 5) number of $1^{\text {st }}$ position cotton squares/plant, and 6) percent fruit shed.

Results: Higher levels of available residual soil N and augmented N applications significantly affected plant biomass and height. Both plant biomass and height increased continuously from 0 lb /acre up to the 150 lb /acre N applied plots. Plant biomass was significantly highest in the $150 \mathrm{lb} /$ acre N applied treatment, but it decreased significantly when an additional 50 lb /acre N was applied ( $200 \mathrm{lb} /$ acre N plots). Leaf chlorophyll content (SPAD reading) increased linearly from zero-N to 100 lb N treatment plots (Fig. 1), but the plots which received the three highest N application rates ( 100,150 , and $200 \mathrm{lb} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{acre}$ ) exhibited relatively consistent leaf chlorophyll readings. Arthropod densities were low across all N fertility treatments during 2012. As a result, treatment effect on overall arthropod abundance was not detected. Nitrogen fertility level influenced fruiting profile and boll maturity. Plants ceased setting additional squares in zero and $50-\mathrm{lb} \mathrm{N}$ plots 2 wk into flowering while higher N plots were actively producing squares.
Zero-N applied plots produced the lowest yield and yield increased curvilinearly, with highest average yield occurring in the 150 and 200 lb N/acre treatments (Fig. 2).


Fig. 1. Effect of nitrogen application rates on fifth mainstem leaf chlorophyll content, 2012.


Fig. 2. Effect of N application rates on lint yield after 10 years of repetitive applications, 2012.

Farm Scale Yield Comparisons of Subsurface Drip Irrigation to Center Pivot Irrigation. James P. Bordovsky, Casey Hardin, and Joe Mustian

Objective: Compare lint yields and irrigation quantities from farm scale cotton production irrigated by subsurface drip irrigation (SDI) and LEPA.


Methodology: Interest in subsurface drip continues as water availability decreases and opportunities for cost share assistance for water conserving irrigation equipment remains available. The question of cotton production using SDI verse pivot is continually asked. The Helms Research Farm at Halfway provides a unique, controlled environment that sheds light on this question. The problems not normally encountered in small plot research, such as limited irrigation water, inconsistent soils, and/or challenging topography, are reflected in results while irrigating with SDI and LEPA systems over past growing seasons. Details of SDI and LEPA irrigation experiments are contained elsewhere within the Helm Summary Report. This individual report contains average commercial cotton gin yields and irrigation amounts used to achieve those yields with respective irrigation systems.

Results: Lack of early season rainfall and typical high winds and low humidity at planting have caused cotton germination problems in SDI areas in some years. Excess drip irrigation to achieve germination also resulted in moving planter applied insecticides away from the seed drill resulting in foliar insecticide battles with thrip. In cool years, young cotton plants in all areas struggled resulting in slow early growth. Yields were
low in 2003, 2005 and 2008 due to cool, wet weather at planting, hail, and short growing season, respectively. Yields were low due to extreme drought and the limited irrigation trials in 2011. Overall, cotton yields have been at or above county averages. For the years where data is available, SDI yields averaged $1270 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ using 16.1 inches compared to LEPA yields of $1024 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ using an average of 12.5 inches of total annual irrigation. Drip yields from various experiments in various years have ranged from 0 to over $2400 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{acre}$. LEPA yields have ranged between 200 and 2000 lb /acre.

Table 1. Commercial cotton gin lint yield and total irrigation water delivered by SDI and LEPA irrigation systems at Helms, 2002-2011.

|  | SDI |  |  |  | LEPA |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Area <br> $(\mathrm{ac})$ | Tot. Irr. <br> $(\mathrm{in})$ | Yld. <br> $(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac})$ | Area <br> $(\mathrm{ac})$ | Tot. Irr. <br> $(\mathrm{in})$ | Yld. <br> $(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac})$ |  |
| 2002 | 71 | 18.47 | 1127 | 84 | 15.71 | 1209 |  |
| 2003 | 71 | 14.95 | 1086 | 103 | 12.86 | 1084 |  |
| 2004 | 71 | 14.00 | 1500 | 103 | 10.00 | 1100 |  |
| 2005 | 53.6 | 10.86 | 1041 | 60 | 3.05 | 828 |  |
| 2006 | 71 | 17.33 | 1566 | 100 | 16.73 | 1537 |  |
| 2007 | 55.3 | 8.95 | 1642 | 104 | 8.06 | 1232 |  |
| 2008 | 71.3 | 18.13 | 1335 | 93 | 15.13 | 909 |  |
| 2011 | 83.0 | 22.14 | 1016 | 68 | 16.00 | 467 |  |
| 2012 | $\underline{75.76}$ | $\underline{19.81}$ | $\underline{1114}$ | $\underline{75}$ | $\underline{15.20}$ | $\underline{850}$ |  |
| Avg. |  | 16.07 | 1270 |  | 12.5 | 1024 |  |
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2012 Rain and Irrigation Amounts at Helm Farm and Halfway
Rainfall (inches) Helms Irrigation Amounts (inches) $D=$ driip irrigation, $L=L E P A$ irrigation, $S=$ spray irrigation, $F=$ furrow water

2012 Rain and Irrigation Amounts at Helm Farm and Halfway
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|  |  |  | $\Sigma 0$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | － | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | － | $\checkmark$ | －+ | ＋ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | － | － | － | $\checkmark$ | － | － | $\checkmark$ | － | に | に | 心 | い | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\sim$ | に | $\Omega$ |

2012 Rain and Irrigation Amounts at Helm Farm and Halfway
2012 Rain and Irrigation Amounts at Helm Farm and Halfway

2012 Rain and Irrigation Amounts at Helm Farm and Halfway
Rainfall (inches) Helms Irrigation Amounts (inches) $D=$ driip irrigation, $L=L E P A$ irrigation, $S=$ spray irrigation, $F=$ furrow water
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| Year | 2012 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm | Helm |  |  |
| Field ID | Field 3 |  |  |
| Exp. Design | Cotton Respon | to Irregation Interval and Field Topography |  |
| Soil Type |  |  |  |
| Field Operations | Date | Activity |  |
| Tillage | 11/29/2011 | Shredder |  |
|  | 1/4/2012 | Chisel | Field 3 |
|  | 1/10/2012 | Off Set Disk | 个 |
|  | 1/23/2012 | Field Cultivator |  |
|  | 2/27/2012 | Lister on 60" spacing |  |
|  | 3/12/2012 | Roller \& Bed Conditioners | (c) |
|  | 5/25/2012 | Rotary Hoe | - |
|  | 6/9/2012 | Rotary Hoe |  |
|  | 6/15/2012 | Rotary Hoe |  |
|  | 6/17/2012 | Rotary Hoe |  |
|  | 6/18/2012 | Rotary Hoe |  |
|  | 7/11/2012 | Cultivate \& Dike |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fertility | 11/29/2011 | $17 \mathrm{lbs} \mathrm{N/ac} \mathrm{+} 58 \mathrm{lbs}$ P/ac ( 10-34-0 applied thru coulter rig) |  |
|  | 7/10-23/2012 | 32 lbs N/ac ( 32-0-0 applied thru Drip on Low Irr.) |  |
|  | 7/10-23/2012 | 56 lbs N/ac ( 32-0-0 applied thru Drip on High Irr.) |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Planting | 5/17/2012 | FM 9180B2F at 56,144 seed/ac |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Herbicide/Growth | 3/12/2012 | Trifluralin 1 qt /ac |  |
| Regulator | 5/18/2012 | Caparol 3 pt/ac |  |
|  | 5/18/2012 | Roundup 32 oz /ac |  |
|  | 6/18/2012 | Mad Dog $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |
|  | 7/16/2012 | Mad Dog $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Insecticide | 6/18/2012 | Acephate 4oz/ac |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Harvest aid | 10/9/2012 | Prep 32 oz/ac |  |
|  | 10/9/2012 | E.T. $2 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |
|  | 10/17/2012 | Firestorm $24 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |
|  | 10/17/2012 | LI 700 1oz/ac |  |
| Irrigation Amt. |  |  |  |
| PrePlant \& Planting | 4/25-5/29 | 7.29in. |  |
| Seasonal | 7/6-9/5 | Trt. 16.93 in.;Trt. 26.93 in. |  |
|  | 7/6-9/5 | Trt. $4 \quad 12.65$ in.; Trt. 512.65 in. |  |
|  | 7/6-9/5 | Trt. 36.43 in. |  |
|  | 7/6-9/5 | Trt. $6 \quad 12.83$ in. |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Rainfall |  |  |  |
| PrePlant \& Planting Seasonal | 1/25-5/22 | 3.31in. |  |
|  | 6/3-9/13 | 9.31 in . |  |
|  |  |  |  |
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| Year | 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farm | Helm |  |
| Field ID | Field 10 |  |
| Exp. Design |  |  |
| Soil Type |  |  |
|  | Date | Activity |
| Tillage | 11/29/2011 | Shredder |
|  | 1/24/2012 | Row Stalker |
|  | 2/29/2012 | Lister on 60" spacing |
|  | 3/12/2012 | Roller \& Bed Conditioners |
|  | 5/1/2012 | Roller \& Bed Conditioners |
|  | 5/25/2012 | Rotary Hoe |
|  | 6/9/2012 | Rotary Hoe |
|  | 6/15/2012 | Rotary Hoe |
|  | 6/17/2012 | Rotary Hoe |
|  | 6/18/2012 | Rotary Hoe |
|  | 7/6/2012 | Cultivate \& Dike |
|  |  |  |
| Fertility | 11/29/2011 | $19 \mathrm{lbs} \mathrm{N/ac} \mathrm{+} 60 \mathrm{lbs} \mathrm{P/ac} \mathrm{( } \mathrm{10-34-0} \mathrm{applied} \mathrm{thru} \mathrm{coulter} \mathrm{rig} \mathrm{)}$ |
|  | 6/12/2012 | 100 lbs N/ac ( 32-0-0 applied thru coulter rig) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Planting | 5/17/2012 | Fibermax 9180 B2F at 56,144 seed/ac |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Herbicide/Growth Regulator | 3/12/2012 | Trifluralin $1 \mathrm{qt} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 3/13/2012 | Gly-Star Gold $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 4/25/2012 | Cornerstone Plus $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 4/25/2012 | Aim 1 oz/ac |
|  | 5/18/2012 | Caparol $3 \mathrm{pt} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 5/18/2012 | Roundup $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 6/2/2012 | Roundup Powermax 32 oz/ac |
|  | 6/20/2012 | Mad Dog $32 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 6/20/2012 | Acephate 4 oz/ac |
|  | 7/17/2012 | Mad Dog 32 oz/ac |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Insecticide | 6/20/2012 | Acephate $4 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  |  | Acephate $4 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Harvest aid | 10/9/2012 | Prep 32 oz/ac |
|  | 10/9/2012 | E.T. 2 oz/ac |
|  | 10/17/2012 | Firestorm $24 \mathrm{oz} / \mathrm{ac}$ |
|  | 10/17/2012 | LI 7001 oz/ac |
|  |  |  |
| Irrigation Amt. |  |  |
| PrePlant \& Planting Seasonal | 4/30-5/9 | 6.22 in. |
|  | 7/8-8/28 | 9.31 in. |
|  |  |  |
| Rainfall |  |  |
| PrePlant \& Planting | 1/25-5/22 | 3.31in. |
| Seasonal | 6/3-9/13 | 9.31 in . |


[^0]:    * 2012 yield, SIWUE, and total irrigation use efficiency were significantly higher for the traditional versus the skip-row treatments (p<.05, Tukey).

