

Field Notes
August 24, 2012
Johnny Saichuk



Parish	Acres	Variety	Cwt/A green	Bbl/A green	Bu/A green	Cwt/A dry	Bbl/A dry	Bu/A dry
Allen	30.7	CLXL745	79.69	49.2	177.1	73.91	45.6	164.2
Cameron	35.7	Cheniere	57.75	35.6	128.3	55.78	34.4	124.0
Concordia	37.4	CL111	77.71	48.0	172.7	73.21	45.2	162.7
St. Landry	44.1	CL152	85.60	52.8	190.2	81.42	50.3	180.9
Vermilion	16.5	Cheniere	75.40	46.5	167.6	71.37	44.1	158.6
Average¹	164.4		75.63	46.7	168.1	71.57	44.2	159.1

This will be the last edition of Field Notes for the 2012 season. Above is a summary of Verification Field yields for this year. I think the results shown here are pretty indicative of the season we had this year. Generally, yields are off a couple of hundred pounds per acre. The fields in Allen, Cameron and Concordia were somewhat disappointing. As I mentioned last week the lower than expected yield in Allen parish was probably a result of rain during pollination and in Cameron parish the low nitrogen fertilizer rate based on N-Star clearly affected yield. St. Landry was excellent all year and performed as anticipated. Vermilion yields were 1600 pounds per acre higher than expected given the problems we had all year long.

The overall appearance of the field in Concordia led me to believe it would yield about the same as St. Landry. To obtain yields of 8000 pounds or higher per acre there cannot be any slip ups during the season. The photographs on the next page might provide the answer to the 300 pound per acre deficit. Planter problems caused skips across the entire field. Replanting filled in the gaps, but did not make up the difference in yield. Even though there were no gaps later in the season, the younger rice just did not produce enough grain and/or the grain was less mature at harvest than the rest of the field. This is probably not the only reason, but is likely a major contributor. The adjacent field had already been harvested and yielded better even though some of it was lodged.

I am getting calls about stink bugs in second crop rice. Some are reporting “too many to count” situations. Apparently they are congregating in the only headed rice around. Many first crop fields were not treated because the numbers never reached threshold values. This situation provided a fairly heavy population with thirty percent of the original acreage as a food source. At least that is may take on the situation.

The other question has been about treating stink bugs in fields intended for crawfish production. The attempt to produce a second crop and crawfish is difficult without having to deal with stink bugs. There is no insecticide labeled to be used in a crawfish pond. The old idea of using malathion to control stink bugs in this situation is one I would not even consider. First, recent research and experience shows the efficacy of malathion to be poor at best. I equate it to spraying water. Second, there is nothing on any malathion label that states it is safe to use in a crawfish pond. Second crop flooded in September or early October intended for crawfish production should be regarded as a crawfish pond, not a rice field. All of the insecticide labels pertain to stink bug control in rice fields.

I don't wish bad weather on anyone, but I sure hope hurricane Isaac leaves us alone.

