2-1-1999

# Field Evaluation of Herbicides on Small Fruit, Vegetable, and Ornamental Crops, 1997

Ron Talbert
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Lance A. Schmidt
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Jennifer A. Wells
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Jeff S. Rutledge
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Dolores A. Parker
*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

# FIELD EVALUATION OF HERBICIDES ON SMALL FRUIT, VEGETABLE, AND ORNAMENTAL CROPS, 1997

R.E. Talbert, L.A. Schmidt, J.A. Wells,
J.S. Rutledge, and D. Parker

ARKANSAS AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

Division of Agriculture | University of Arkansas

February 1999 | Research Series 461

Editing and cover design by Karen Eskew

Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arkansas Division of Agriculture, Fayetteville. Milo J. Shult, Vice President for Agriculture and Director; Charles J. Scifres, Associate Vice President for Agriculture. PS1.2M0299.



ISSN:0099-5010 CODEN:AKAMA6

# FIELD EVALUATION OF HERBICIDES ON SMALL FRUIT, VEGETABLE, AND ORNAMENTAL CROPS, 1997

**Ron Talbert**
University Professor

**Lance A. Schmidt**
Research Specialist

**Jennifer A. Wells**
Graduate Assistant

**Jeff S. Rutledge**
Graduate Assistant

**Dolores A. Parker**
Undergraduate Assistant

*Authors are all in the Department of Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences*

**Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station**
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

## SUMMARY

Growers generally use herbicides to efficiently produce high-quality fruit and vegetables for processing or fresh market sales. Due to the smaller acreage of these crops compared to major field crops, fewer herbicides are registered for use in fruit and vegetable crops than for field crops. Each year, new herbicides are evaluated under Arkansas growing conditions with the objective of improving the herbicide technology for the grower, processor, and ultimately the consumer. This report includes studies on the control of many of the more serious weed problems in important crops of this region, including snapbeans, spinach, southern pea, watermelon, cantaloupe, tomato, blackberry, and grape. In addition, the report includes information on the tolerance of selected bedding plants to some effective herbicides.

# CONTENTS

Page

Introduction .......... 7

Methods and Results .......... 8
- Evaluation of Herbicides for Snapbean, Lowell .......... 8
- Evaluation of Herbicides for Fall Spinach, Kibler .......... 9
- Yellow Nutsedge Control in Southern Pea, Kibler .......... 9
- Yellow Nutsedge Control in Southern Pea, Fayetteville .......... 10
- Cultivar Tolerance of Southern Pea to Sulfentrazone, Fayetteville .......... 10
- Bensulide Study in Watermelon, Kibler .......... 10
- Watermelon Study for Yellow Nutsedge Control, Fayetteville .......... 11
- Cantaloupe Study for Yellow Nutsedge Control, Fayetteville .......... 11
- Primocane Suppression in Blackberries, Fayetteville .......... 11
- Weed Control in Grapes, Fayetteville .......... 12
- Weed Control in Tomato with Rimsulfuron, Fayetteville .......... 12
- Mixed Cover Crop Verification in Tomato, Fayetteville .......... 12
- Quinclorac Drift Simulation on Okra, Tomato, and Bell Pepper, Fayetteville .......... 13
- Evaluation of Herbicides for Dianthus, Fayetteville .......... 13
- Evaluation of Herbicides for Salvia, Fayetteville .......... 14
- Evaluation of Herbicides for Geranium, Fayetteville .......... 14

Tables .......... 15

Appendix Tables .......... 31

# ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was made possible in part by financial support through the IR-4 program in the Southern region. The following companies supplied herbicides used in these experiments: American Cyanamid, BASF, Bayer, DowElanco, DuPont, FMC, Gowen, Monsanto, Novartis, Rhone-Poulenc, Rohm and Haas, UAP, Valent, and Zeneca. Seed and transplants were supplied by Asgrow Seed Co., Ball Seed Co., and Connie's Greenhouse. The financial and technical support received from these companies is appreciated. Appreciation for assistance in these studies is extended to Dennis Motes, resident director; Steve Eaton, research assistant; and the technicians of the Vegetable Substation, Kibler; and Steve Brown and William Russell of Allen Canning Company.

# FIELD EVALUATION OF HERBICIDES ON SMALL FRUIT, VEGETABLE, AND ORNAMENTAL CROPS, 1997

R.E. Talbert, L.A. Schmidt, J.A. Wells,
J.S. Rutledge, and D. Parker

## INTRODUCTION

Field evaluations of herbicides provide the chemical industry, governmental agencies such as IR-4, and the Arkansas Agricultural Experiment Station with an evaluation of herbicide performance on small fruit, vegetable, and ornamental crops grown under Arkansas conditions. This report also provides a means for disseminating information to interested private and public service weed scientists.

Experiments at the Arkansas Agricultural Research and Extension Center in Fayetteville were conducted on blackberry, grape, summer squash, tomato, watermelons, cantaloupe, bell peppers, okra, southern pea, and ornamentals. At the Vegetable Substation near Kibler, experiments were conducted on fall spinach, southern pea, and watermelon. A snapbean trial was conducted on a private farm near Lowell.

The chemical names and formulations of the herbicides used in these experiments are listed in Appendix Table 1. A table for converting metric units to English units can be found on page 36.

At Fayetteville, trials were conducted on a Captina silt loam with 1 to 2% organic matter and pH of 5.9. Soil at Lowell was a Perridge silt loam with 1.5% organic matter and pH of 5.3. At the Vegetable Substation, trials were conducted on a Roxana silt loam with 1% organic matter and pH of 6.9. Unless stated otherwise, the experimental design for all experiments was a randomized complete block with four replications. Preplant-incorporated, preemergence, delayed preemergence, cracking, postemergence, and postemergence-directed treatments were applied in 187 L/ha of water. Liquid herbicides were applied with a hand-held, carbon-dioxide pressurized sprayer.

Treatments involving timing and incorporation were (1) preplant incorporated (PPI), applied to the soil and incorporated prior to planting; (2) preemergence (PRE), applied to the soil surface soon after planting; (3) cracking (CRAC), applied 3 to 5 days after planting prior to emergence; (4) delayed-preemergence (DPRE) applied 5 to 7 days after planting prior to emergence, (5) over-the-top of transplants preemergence to weeds (POST-TP); (5) postemergence (POST), applied over-the-top to emerged crops and weeds at various stages — determined either by days after planting or by crop and weed growth stage; and (6) postemergence-directed (POST-DIR), applied to basal portion of the crop. The following environmental conditions were recorded for each application: air temperature (C); soil temperature (C) at 8 cm deep; soil surface moisture as wet, moist, or dry; and percent relative humidity (RH).

Percentage of weed control by species was visually estimated: 0 represents no effect, and 100 represents complete control. Ranges for weed control are as follows: 70 to 79%, fair; 80 to 89%, good; and 90 to 100%, excellent. Weed control less than 70% is considered to be poor. Crop injury was assessed by visual estimation of percent injury: 0 represents no effect, and 100 represents complete plant kill. Crop injury ratings of less than 30% indicate crop tolerance. Crop yields are reported in metric tons per hectare unless stated otherwise. Least Significant Difference (LSD) values at the 0.05 level of significance were calculated for each set of treatment means.

Climatological data for 1997 at Fayetteville are presented in Appendix Table 2, and for the Vegetable Substation in Appendix 3. Standardized Plant (Bayer) Codes, as recognized by the Weed Science Society of America for weeds, appearing in this report are presented in Appendix Table 4.

## METHODS AND RESULTS

Pertinent experimental details and a brief discussion of the results of these studies follow, and tabulated results are shown in Tables 1 to 16. Additional abbreviations are used in the tables: cm, centimeter; COC, crop oil concentrate; cv, cultivar; DAT, days after treatment; fb, followed by; kg/ha, kilograms active ingredient per hectare; NS, not significant; pl, plants; TM, tank mix; V2, first trifoliolate stage of legume; var, variety; v/v, volume per volume; WA, wetting agent; WAE, weeks after emergence; WAP, weeks after planting; and wk, week(s).

### Evaluation of Herbicides for Snapbeans (*Phaseolus vulgaris*), Lowell (Table 1).

Snapbeans (cv. Endurance) were planted May 5, 1997, in 3- by 6-m plots with four rows spaced 76 cm apart. PPI and PRE treatments were applied the same day as planting (air 24EC; soil 21EC, moist; RH 62%). Cracking treatments were applied May 10, 1997 (air 22EC; soil 20EC, moist; RH 67%), and POST treatments were applied June 6,1997 (air 27EC; soil 24EC, moist; RH 70%). Weed control and crop injury evaluations were made 5 and 7 WAP. Plots were harvested 8 WAP on July 2, 1997.

The treatment providing the most outstanding, full-season control of common lambsquarters, Palmer amaranth, and Italian ryegrass and greatest yield was clomazone, 0.56 kg/ha, PRE fb fomesafen (Reflex®), 0.21 kg/ha + AG-98, 0.25% v/v, POST. Treatments providing good to excellent season-long control of common lambsquarters and Palmer amaranth were metolachlor, 1.12 kg/ha, applied PRE fb fomesafen (Flexstar® HL), 0.21 kg/ha + AG-98, 0.25 % v/v, POST or tank-mixed with fomesafen (Flexstar® HL), 0.28 kg/ha, applied at the CRACKING stage; and lactofen, 0.28 kg/ ha, PRE. Lactofen at 0.14 and 0.21 kg/ha, PRE, provided excellent early-season control of common lambsquarters and Palmer amaranth, but control began to break by the 7-wk rating. The standard POST treatments that normally provide excellent weed control were not as effective this season due to the larger weed size at time of application.

Slight bleaching of snapbeans due to clomazone application was evident early in the season; however, no bleaching was noticed by 8 wk. Yield differences between treatments were directly influenced by the weed control that each treatment provided.

**Evaluation of Herbicides for Fall Spinach (*Spinachia oleracea*), Kibler (Table 2).**

Spinach (cv. Fall Green) was planted September 19, 1997, in plots 1.3 by 5 m with six rows spaced 20 cm apart. PPI and PRE treatments were applied the same day (air 31EC; soil 27EC, moist; RH 82%). POST treatments were applied October 10, 1997 (air 24EC; soil 22EC, moist; RH 90%). Plots were not harvested due to the severe frost that occurred in the area.

Henbit was the most predominant and competitive weed in the experiment. Metolachlor at 1.12 or 2.24 kg/ha applied PRE; dimethenamid at 0.56 or 1.12 kg/ha applied PRE; and phenmedipham at 0.28 kg/ha + metolachlor at 1.12 kg/ha applied POST gave excellent control of henbit and provided good to excellent control of sibara and shepherdspurse by 10 wk. Chlorpropham at 2.24 kg/ha + phenmedipham at 0.28 kg/ha applied POST; and cycloate at 2.24 kg/ha applied PPI followed by either clorpyralid at 0.08 kg/ha or phenmedipham at 0.28 kg/ha applied POST gave good to excellent control of sibara and shepherdspurse by 10 wk, but did not effectively control henbit. Dimethenamid at 1.12 kg/ha PRE caused severe injury to spinach at 3 wk but had begun to grow out of the injury by 5 wk. Spinach injury at the 10-wk rating was caused by frost.

**Yellow Nutsedge (*Cyperus esculentus*) Control in Southern Pea (*Vigna unguiculata*), Kibler (Table 3).**

Southern pea (cv. 92-551) was planted June 5, 1997, in plots 2 by 3 m with three rows spaced 50 cm apart. PPI and PRE treatments were applied the same day (air 27EC; soil 28EC, moist; RH 75%). Cracking treatments were applied June 9, 1997 (air 22EC; soil 24EC, moist; RH 95%). POST treatments were applied June 30, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 26EC, moist; RH 83%). Visual ratings of percent injury to southern pea and percent control of yellow nutsedge were taken at 3, 6, and 9 WAT. Yield was taken September 9, 1997.

Yellow nutsedge was the most predominant and competitive weed in all test plots. All rates of sulfentrazone applied PRE and PPI provided season-long control of yellow nutsedge. These treatments caused slight injury to southern pea early in the season with no effect on final yield. Sulfentrazone applied at cracking significantly injured southern pea all season long. Metolachlor and fomesafen applied PRE provided fair yellow nutsedge control with slight injury to southern pea early in the season. Dual® applied PPI alone provided season long control of 83% at 9 WAT with no southern pea injury. Halosulfuron applied POST provided fair control of yellow nutsedge with 30 to 43% injury to southern pea observed.

**Yellow Nutsedge (*Cyperus esculentus*) Control in Southern Pea (*Vigna unguiculata*), Fayetteville (Table 4).**

Southern pea (cv. Encore) was planted June 26, 1997, in plots 2 by 3 m with three rows spaced 50 cm apart. PPI and PRE treatments were applied the same day (air 30EC; soil 32EC, dry; RH 65%). Cracking treatments were applied July 1, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 26EC, dry; RH 90%). POST treatments were applied July 23, 1997 (air 30EC; soil 30EC, moist; RH 90%). Visual ratings of percent injury to southern pea and percent control of yellow nutsedge were taken at 2, 4, 6, and 8 WAT, and southern pea yield was evaluated.

Yellow nutsedge was the most predominant and competitive weed in all test plots. Metolachlor and fomesafen applied PRE provided good yellow nutsedge control all season with slight injury to southern pea early in the season. Metolachlor applied PPI alone provided season-long control of yellow nutsedge with slight injury to southern pea. All rates of sulfentrazone applied PRE and PPI provided fair control of yellow nutsedge. These treatments caused slight injury to southern pea early in the season with no effect on final yield. Sulfentrazone applied at cracking significantly injured southern pea all season. Halosulfuron applied POST provided fair control of yellow nutsedge with some observable injury to southern pea.

**Cultivar Tolerance of Southern Pea (*Vigna unguiculata*) to Sulfentrazone, Fayetteville (Table 5).**

Five cultivars of southern pea were evaluated for their tolerance to sulfentrazone. These included Coronet and Mississippi Silver, which are indeterminate growth types, and Encore, Early Acre, and Early Scarlet, which are determinate growth types.

All cultivars were planted and sprayed with sulfentrazone PPI at 0, 0.21, 0.42 and 0.63 kg/ha on June 26, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 32EC, dry; RH 65%). Plot size was 0.5 m by 3 m with one row per plot and four replications. Response was assessed by percent visual injury at 3, 6, and 9 WAT and final yield.

Mississippi Silver and Coronet, the indeterminate types, were the most tolerant cultivars to sulfentrazone. Mississippi Silver showed no significant injury at any sulfentrazone rate, at any of the ratings. Coronet showed significant injury of 18% at 3 WAT with 0.42 and 0.63 kg/ha of sulfentrazone, but showed no significant injury at 6 or 9 WAT with any of the rates. The determinate type peas were less tolerant to the herbicide. Encore showed significant injury at all three rates until 6 WAT; however, there was no significant injury at 9 WAT. Early Scarlet showed significant injury of at least 31% at 3, 6, and 9 WAT to 0.42 kg/ha of sulfentrazone. Finally, Early Acre showed significant injury of up to 28% at rates of 0.42 and 0.63 kg/ha of sulfentrazone at 3, 6, and 9 WAT.

The study was planted in an area of a heavy yellow nutsedge infestation of 200 to 500 plants/$m^2$. This was impossible to maintain weed-free without herbicide treatments; therefore, yield increased with rate of sulfentrazone.

**Bensulide Study in Watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus*), Kibler (Table 6).**

Watermelon seeds (cv. Crimson Sweet) were planted May 1, 1997, in plots 3.5 by 9 m with one row per plot. PRE and PPI treatments were applied the same day (air 23EC; soil 21EC, moist; RH 68%). PRE applications were immediately followed by irrigation with 0.2 in. of water. Evaluations for weed control were made at 2, 4, and 8 WAE.

The predominant weed species were goosegrass, johnsongrass, and eclipta. Bensulide at both rates provided better control of purslane and eclipta when immediately irrigated than when applied PPI. Overall, bensulide provided fair to good control of all weed species until 4 WAE. At 8 WAE control of all weed species was poor. Yield was not taken due to severe weed infestation.

**Watermelon (*Citrullus lanatus*) Study for Yellow Nutsedge Control, Fayetteville (Table 7).**

Watermelon seeds (cv. Crimson Sweet) were planted May 21, 1997, in 2- by 3.5-m plots with one row per plot. PRE treatments were applied the same day (air 21EC; soil 23EC, moist; RH 62%) and POST treatments were applied June 27, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 31EC, moist; RH 75%). Evaluations of yellow nutsedge control and crop injury were made at 3, 6, and 9 WAT, and final yield was evaluated.

Yellow nutsedge was the most predominant and competitive weed in all test plots. All rates of halosulfuron applied PRE provided fair to good control of yellow nutsedge through 9 wk. Both rates of halosulfuron applied POST provided good control of yellow nustedge. PRE applications of bensulide and ethalfluralin provided very poor control.

PRE and POST applications of halosulfuron caused slight injury early in the season but did not affect final yield. There was no injury to watermelon from applications of bensulide or ethalfluralin.

**Cantaloupe (*Cucumis melo*) Study for Yellow Nutsedge Control, Fayetteville (Table 8).**

Cantaloupe seeds (cv. Mission Hybrid) were planted May 21, 1997, in 2- by 3.5-m plots with one row per plot. PRE treatments were applied the same day (air 21EC; soil 23EF, moist; RH 62%) and POST treatments were applied June 27, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 31EC, moist; RH 75%). Evaluations of yellow nutsedge control and crop injury were made at 3, 6, and 9 WAT, and final yield was evaluated.

Yellow nutsedge was the most predominant and competitive weed in all test plots. All rates of halosulfuron applied PRE provided fair to good control of yellow nutsedge through the 9 wk. Both rates of halosulfuron applied POST provided good control of yellow nustedge. PRE applications of bensulide and ethalfluralin provided very poor control.

PRE and POST applications of halosulfuron cased slight crop injury early in the season but did not affect final yield. There was no injury to cantaloupe from applications of bensulide or ethalfluralin.

**Primocane Suppression in Blackberries (*Rubus* spp.), Fayetteville (Table 9).**

Established blackberry (cv. Cheyenne) plots were 1 by 2 m with 1 row per plot. POST-dir treatments were applied to 13-cm primocanes on May 15, 1997 (air 18EC; soil 17EC, moist; RH 72%), May 29, 1997 (air 20EC; soil 18EC, moist; RH 65%) and June 12, 1997(air 24EC; soil 23EC, moist; RH 74%). The standard included a mowing treatment that was performed on the same dates as the herbicide applications. Evaluations of raspberry injury and primocane suppression were taken at 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 wk after the first POST-dir application.

Three POST-dir applications of 1.12 kg/ha of lactofen caused slight injury to blackberries and suppressed primocanes fairly well throughout the fourth week of the experiment. Three POST-dir applications of 2.24 kg/ha of lactofen caused slightly more injury than the 1.12 kg/ha rate and initially suppressed primocanes better. No significant differences in yields were observed among treatments.

**Weed Control in Grapes (*Vitis labrusca*), Fayetteville (Table 10).**

Grape (cv. Concord) plots were 2.5 by 12 m with three vines per plot. All test plots were treated May 14, 1997 (air 18EC; soil 16EC, moist; RH 55%) with a POST-dir application of oryzalin, 2.24 kg/ha + diuron, 2.24 kg/ha for residual control. POST-dir applications of glufosinate, glyphosate, and paraquat were compared in a May 28, 1997, application (air 25EC; soil 23EC, moist; RH 55%), June 18, 1997 (air 31EC; soil 27EC, moist; RH 95%), and July 15, 1997 (air 32EC; soil 28EC, moist; RH 80%). Small trees found in the plots were clipped and treated with glyphosate on each application date.

The POST-dir applications of glufosinate, 1.12 kg/ha + ammonium sulfate, 3.36 kg/ha; glyphosate, 1.12 kg/ha; or paraquat, 0.56 kg/ha + AG-98, 0.25 % v/v provided excellent control of bermudagrass and common dandelion by 8 wk. Applications of glufosinate and glyphosate provided good suppression of trumpet creeper by the end of the season, but never killed it. All three herbicides were effective in controlling grape suckers at the base of the vines. No injury to the grape vines was evident throughout the experiment. Yields did not differ significantly among treatments, except for the paraquat treatment which had significantly lower yields.

**Weed Control in Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) with Rimsulfuron, Fayetteville (Table 11).**

Tomatoes (cv. Mt. Spring) were transplanted into 1- by 2.5-m plots (one row per plot, four plants per row) on May 13, 1997. Plants were spaced 61 cm apart. PPI and post-transplant PRE treatments were applied the day of transplanting (air 24EC; soil 20EC, moist; RH 80%). POST treatments were applied June 12, 1997 (air 27EC; soil 26EC, moist; RH 82%). Ratings were taken 9 wk after the PPI and PRE applications.

Rimsulfuron at 0.017, 0.026 and 0.035 kg/ha applied at the PRE, POST, or PRE fb POST timings provided excellent control of Palmer amaranth, and good to excellent control of yellow nutsedge at the 9-wk rating. Control of goosegrass with rimsulfuron was poor at any rate or timing. The standard program of metribuzin at 0.28 kb/ha + sethoxydim at 0.21 kg/ha + COC at 1% v/v applied POST effectively controlled Palmer amaranth, yellow nutsedge and goosegrass. There was no significant injury observed from any treatment. No differences were found in average number of fruit or average weight of fruit per plant.

**Mixed Cover Crop Verification in Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill), Fayetteville (Table 12).**

Tomatoes (cv. Mt. Spring) were transplanted into 4.5- by 6-m plots (2 rows per plot, 12 plants per row) with mixed cover crops of rye plus vetch, black plastic, and no cover on May 13, 1997. Tomato plants were staked, fertilized, and irrigated as recommended.

The entire test area was planted in September, 1996, with two parts rye (39 kg/ha) plus one part vetch (14 kg/ha). The black plastic and no cover plots were burned down (chemically desiccated) in October, 1996, with glyphosate (Roundup Ultra) (air 15EC; soil 13EC, moist; RH 65%). Cover crop plots were desiccated with 0.84 kg/ha paraquat plus 0.4 kg/ha metribuzin (air 18EC; soil 14EC, moist; RH 55%) on April 30, 1997. One week prior to transplanting, black plastic and no cover plots were treated with trifluralin, 0.84 kg/ha, PPI (air 22EC; soil 18EC, moist; RH 80%). Black plastic was also laid on the appropriate plots at this time. On July 9, 1997, all plots were POST-dir with 0.28 kg/ha metribuzin (air 27EC; soil 20EC, moist; RH 80%).

The total number of tomato fruits and the average fruit weight per plant were similar in plots with mixed cover crops, black plastic, and no cover.

**Quinclorac Drift Simulation on Okra (*Abelmoschus esculentus* L. Moench), Tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) and Bell Pepper (*Capsicum annuum* var. *annuum* L.), Fayetteville (Table 13).**

Four okra (cv. Clemson Spineless), four tomato (cv. Mt. Spring), and three bell pepper (cv. Renegade) plants were transplanted into 1- by 5.5-m plots on May 13, 1997. Okra and tomatoes were spaced 46 cm apart, and bell peppers were spaced 61 cm apart within each plot. Drift simulated rates of quinclorac were 1, 0.2, 0.04, 0.008, and 0.0016% of 0.42 kg/ha, the labeled rate in rice production. As a standard treatment, 2, 4-D amine was applied at 0.2% of the 1.12 kg/ha rate. All treatments were applied June 21, 1997 (air 27EC; soil 25EC, moist; RH 78%) to 28- to 35-cm okra (blooming), 50- to 67-cm tomatoes (2 weeks after first bloom) and 14- to 25-cm bell peppers (blooming). Plots were fertilized and irrigated according to normal production practices and maintained weed-free.

No significant differences in average number of fruit per plant or average weight of fruit per plant were found in this study. Following the drift simulated applications, there were noticeable changes in the development of new growth.

**Evaluation of Herbicides for Dianthus (*Dianthus* spp.), Fayetteville (Table 14).**

Dianthus plants were transplanted on September 2, 1997, into 15-cm standard pots. Sunshine Potting Soil Mix™ was used as the growing medium. Plot size was one pot, with one plant per pot. There were four replications.

All herbicides were applied POST-TP on October 2, 1997 (air 28EC; soil 31EC, moist; RH 75%). Sprayable formulations were applied using a laboratory spray chamber. Granular applications were applied using a shaker jar applicator. The dianthus were 10 cm tall at the time of application.

There were no weeds present in any of the plots during the experiment. Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen applied at 13.46 kg/ha and oxyfluorfen + pendimethalin applied at 13.46 kg/ha caused significant injury at 10 DAT, but plants recovered and showed no significant injury at 28 or 56 DAT. Oryzalin alone caused significant injury at 4.49 kg/ha and 8.98 kg/ha early, but the plants recovered, and no injury was observed at 28 or 56 DAT.

**Evaluation of Herbicides for Salvia (*Salvia splendens*), Fayetteville (Table 15).**

Salvia plants were transplanted September 2, 1997, into 15-cm standard pots. Sunshine Potting Soil Mix™ was used as the growing medium. Plot size was one pot, with one plant per pot. There were four replications.

All herbicides were applied POST-TP on October 2, 1997 (air 28EC; soil 31EC, moist; RH 75%). Sprayable formulations were applied using a laboratory spray chamber. Granular applications were applied using a shaker jar applicator. The salvia were 15 cm tall at the time of application.

There were no weeds present in any of the plots during the experiment. Oryzalin and oryzalin + oxyfluorfen caused no injury at any rate or any rating time. Dithiopyr applied at 1.12 and 2.24 kg/ha caused stunting at 10, 28, and 56 DAT. Prodiamine applied at 3.37 and 6.73 kg/ha caused significant injury at all three rating times.

**Evaluation of Herbicides for Geranium (*Geranium* spp.), Fayetteville (Table 16).**

Geranium plants were transplanted on September 2, 1997, into 15-cm standard pots. Sunshine Potting Soil Mix™ was used as the growing medium. Plot size was one pot, with one plant per pot. There were four replications.

All herbicides were applied POST-TP on October 2, 1997 (air 28EC; soil 31EC, moist; RH 75%). Sprayable formulations were applied using a laboratory spray chamber. Granular applications were applied using a shaker jar applicator. The geraniums were 10 cm tall at the time of application.

There were no weeds present in any of the plots during the experiment. Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen applied at 3.37, 6.73, and 13.46 kg/ha did not cause any injury at any rating time. Stunting was observed at both 28 and 56 DAT with prodiamine applied at 6.73 kg/ha. Oryzalin at 4.49 and 8.98 kg/ha caused injury at 10 and 28 DAT but the plants recovered and no injury was observed at 56 DAT. Dithiopyr caused injury at 10 DAT at rates of 0.56, 1.12, and 2.24 kg/ha. The plants treated with the low rate of 0.56 kg/ha recovered and showed no injury at 28 or 56 DAT. The plants treated with 1.12 kg/ha showed injury at 10 and 28 DAT but recovered by 56 DAT; however, plants treated with the high rate of 2.24 kg/ha showed significant stunting at 10, 28, and 56 DAT.

**Table 1. Evaluation of herbicides for snapbeans, Lowell, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | | | | Effect on snapbeans | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CHEAL | | AMAPA | | LOLMU | | Injury | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Weedy check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.7 |
| Hand-weeded check | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 8.6 |
| Clomazone, 0.56, PRE fb fomesafen (Flexstar®), 0.21 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 95 | 96 | 86 | 93 | 85 | 96 | 23 | 9 | 10.4 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE fb fomesafen (Reflex®), 0.14, CRAC | 88 | 75 | 94 | 95 | 55 | 81 | 10 | 3 | 8.8 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE fb fomesafen (Reflex®), 0.28, CRAC | 87 | 73 | 95 | 95 | 73 | 93 | 9 | 1 | 7.8 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE fb fomesafen (Flexstar®), 0.28, CRAC | 90 | 85 | 95 | 94 | 73 | 94 | 13 | 3 | 9.3 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE fb fomesafen (Flexstar®), 0.21 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 83 | 81 | 95 | 95 | 52 | 90 | 13 | 8 | 10.4 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE fb halosulfuron, 0.03 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 88 | 78 | 95 | 91 | 78 | 73 | 13 | 3 | 9.0 |
| Trifluralin, 0.56, PPI fb halosulfuron, 0.03 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 63 | 76 | 87 | 80 | 54 | 69 | 20 | 11 | 8.2 |
| Trifluralin, 0.56, PPI fb imazethapyr, 0.03 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 83 | 70 | 78 | 85 | 69 | 80 | 15 | 4 | 6.8 |
| Trifluralin, 0.56, PPI fb bentazon, 0.42 + fomesafen (Reflex®), 0.21 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 78 | 70 | 51 | 78 | 68 | 56 | 24 | 4 | 7.6 |
| Trifluralin, 0.56, PPI fb imazethapyr, 0.03 + bentazon, 0.42 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 73 | 78 | 54 | 80 | 60 | 78 | 10 | 1 | 9.3 |

**continued**

**Table 1. Continued.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | | | | Effect on snapbeans | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CHEAL | | AMAPA | | LOLMU | | Injury | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | - - - - - - - - - - | - - - - - | - - - - | (%) | - - - - | - - - - | - - - - | - - - - | (mt/ha) |
| Lactofen, 0.14, PRE | 91 | 70 | 94 | 81 | 30 | 40 | 13 | 8 | 7.4 |
| Lactofen, 0.21, PRE | 90 | 69 | 95 | 83 | 43 | 34 | 18 | 6 | 8.0 |
| Lactofen, 0.28, PRE | 86 | 80 | 94 | 91 | 33 | 38 | 16 | 5 | 8.8 |
| Bentazon, 0.42 + fomesafen (Reflex®), 0.21 + sethoxydim, 0.22 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | — | 43 | — | 51 | — | 49 | — | 8 | 7.5 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.03 + quizalofop, 0.07 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | — | 36 | — | 43 | — | 81 | — | 0 | 6.9 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.03 + sethoxydim, 0.22 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | — | 34 | — | 46 | — | 51 | — | 0 | 2.8 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 9 | 9 | 9 | 7 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 1.7 |

[a] Evaluations were made 4 and 8 wk after planting. The 8-wk evaluation corresponds to 4 wk after POST applications.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated, PRE = preemergence immediately after planting, CRAC = cracking stage, and POST = postemergence over-the-top of foliage.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 2. Evaluation of herbicides for fall spinach, Kibler, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a,b] | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LAMAM | | | CAPBP | | | SIBVI | | | Spinach injury | | |
| Treatment description[c] | 3 wk | 5 wk | 10 wk | 3 wk | 5 wk | 10 wk | 3 wk | 5 wk | 10 wk | 3 wk | 5 wk | 10 wk |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 47 |
| Cycloate, 2.24, PPI | 98 | 34 | 72 | 81 | 84 | 90 | 84 | 68 | 78 | 8 | 1 | 35 |
| Cycloate, 2.24, DPRE | 86 | 41 | 67 | 78 | 75 | 84 | 86 | 78 | 75 | 9 | 4 | 43 |
| Metolachlor, 1.12, PRE | 99 | 85 | 92 | 90 | 91 | 88 | 97 | 95 | 92 | 10 | 10 | 52 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24, PRE | 100 | 93 | 95 | 94 | 95 | 92 | 83 | 94 | 89 | 25 | 16 | 66 |
| Chlorpropham, 2.24, POST | — | 40 | 78 | — | 34 | 65 | — | 33 | 56 | — | 4 | 26 |
| Phenmedipham, 0.28 + sethoxydim, 0.28, POST | — | 35 | 88 | — | 81 | 73 | — | 79 | 81 | — | 1 | 23 |
| Chlorpropham, 2.24 + phenmedipham, 0.28, POST | — | 53 | 74 | — | 86 | 92 | — | 88 | 89 | — | 11 | 46 |
| Cycloate, 2.24, PPI fb clopyralid, 0.08, POST | 96 | 40 | 78 | 89 | 90 | 80 | 89 | 86 | 92 | 16 | 4 | 44 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.02, POST | — | 44 | 68 | — | 48 | 78 | — | 48 | 74 | — | 29 | 68 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.04, POST | — | 41 | 59 | — | 43 | 83 | — | 43 | 76 | — | 13 | 67 |
| Dimethenamid, 0.56, PRE | 99 | 91 | 90 | 90 | 90 | 92 | 90 | 91 | 92 | 15 | 8 | 65 |
| Dimethenamid, 1.12, PRE | 100 | 93 | 92 | 97 | 89 | 95 | 90 | 91 | 90 | 56 | 23 | 73 |
| Phenmedipham, 0.28 + metolachlor, 1.12, POST | — | 96 | 95 | — | 94 | 83 | — | 93 | 95 | — | 1 | 27 |
| Cycloate, 2.24, PPI fb phenmedipham, 0.28, POST | 97 | 93 | 84 | 91 | 96 | 89 | 86 | 96 | 89 | 9 | 3 | 42 |
| Fluroxypyr, 0.14, POST | — | 35 | 68 | — | 38 | 73 | — | 43 | 82 | — | 6 | 38 |
| Fluroxypyr, 0.14 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | — | 54 | 72 | — | 54 | 78 | — | 46 | 79 | — | 19 | 52 |
| LSD (0.05)[d] | 3 | 17 | 26 | 5 | 13 | 32 | 7 | 11 | 29 | 8 | 10 | NS |

[a] Evaluations were made 3, 5, and 10 wk after planting. The 5- and 10-wk evaluations correspond to 2 and 7 wk after POST applications.
[b] The 10-wk ratings were taken following a severe frost that hit the area.
[c] PPI = preplant incorporated, PRE = preemergence immediately after planting, POST = postemergence over-the-top of foliage, and DPRE = delayed-preemergence.
[d] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 3. Yellow nutsedge control in southern peas, Kibler, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | Effect on southern pea | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYPES | | | Injury | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |
| Bentazon, 0.84 + COC | | | | | | | |
| (Agri-Dex, 1.25% v/v), POST | 0 | 88 | 53 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 0.4 |
| Imazethapyr, 0.07, PPI | 73 | 93 | 85 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24, PPI | 80 | 95 | 83 | 13 | 10 | 8 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PRE | 78 | 88 | 80 | 30 | 15 | 10 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 78 | 83 | 70 | 20 | 23 | 18 | 0.5 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PRE | 65 | 83 | 73 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 0.5 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 76 | 85 | 83 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 0.5 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24 + | | | | | | | |
| fomesafen, 0.14, PRE | 58 | 88 | 68 | 10 | 10 | 3 | 0.4 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24 + | | | | | | | |
| fomesafen, 0.28, PRE | 38 | 65 | 68 | 18 | 3 | 3 | 0.5 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.039 + WA | | | | | | | |
| (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 83 | 40 | 0 | 33 | 30 | 0.5 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.019 + WA | | | | | | | |
| (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 43 | 50 | 0 | 13 | 10 | 0.5 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, CRAC | 80 | 90 | 53 | 40 | 43 | 43 | 0.4 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, CRAC | 78 | 88 | 70 | 38 | 33 | 30 | 0.5 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 23 | 30 | 35 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 0.1 |

[a] Evaluations were made 3, 6, and 9 wk after planting. The 6- and 9-wk evaluations correspond to 2 and 5 wk after POST applications.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated, PRE = preemergence, CRAC = cracking stage, POST = postemergence.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 4. Yellow nutsedge control in southern pea, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | | Effect on southern pea | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYPES | | | | Injury | | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 2 wk | 4 wk | 6 wk | 8 wk | 2 wk | 4 wk | 6 wk | 8 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 |
| Bentazon, 0.84 + COC (Agri-Dex, 1.25% v/v), POST | 0 | 0 | 82 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 0.9 |
| Imazethapyr, 0.07, PPI | 68 | 80 | 88 | 85 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1.1 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24, PPI | 86 | 83 | 91 | 88 | 10 | 15 | 11 | 5 | 1.0 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PRE | 60 | 68 | 74 | 68 | 13 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 1.1 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 50 | 58 | 80 | 68 | 23 | 20 | 9 | 8 | 1.1 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PRE | 50 | 68 | 61 | 58 | 13 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1.0 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 55 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 15 | 18 | 3 | 0 | 0.8 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24 + fomesafen, 0.14, PRE | 83 | 80 | 78 | 68 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 0.9 |
| Metolachlor, 2.24 + fomesafen, 0.28, PRE | 86 | 86 | 91 | 85 | 13 | 13 | 9 | 5 | 1.0 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.039 + WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 0 | 78 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 46 | 26 | 0.5 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.019 + WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 0 | 64 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 25 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, CRAC | 45 | 53 | 45 | 35 | 50 | 60 | 0 | 7 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, CRAC | 55 | 63 | 58 | 45 | 23 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0.8 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 17 | 13 | 28 | 22 | 14 | 20 | 8 | 1 | 0.4 |

[a] Evaluations were made 2, 4, 6, and 8 wk after planting. The 6- and 8-wk evaluations correspond to 2 and 4 wk after POST applications.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated, PRE = preemergence, CRAC = cracking stage, POST = postemergence.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 5. Cultivar tolerance of southern peas to sulfentrazone, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | Effect on southern pea | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYPES | | | Injury | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| **ENCORE:** | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 70 | 70 | 71 | 10 | 23 | 9 | 0.8 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 80 | 73 | 83 | 20 | 23 | 10 | 1.1 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.63, PPI | 70 | 80 | 90 | 20 | 18 | 13 | 1.5 |
| **CORONET:** | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.3 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 73 | 83 | 84 | 13 | 13 | 3 | 0.7 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 60 | 70 | 76 | 18 | 15 | 5 | 1.1 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.63, PPI | 73 | 85 | 74 | 18 | 16 | 9 | 1.3 |
| **EARLY SCARLET:** | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.7 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 58 | 48 | 79 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 0.8 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 75 | 83 | 88 | 33 | 48 | 31 | 0.8 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.63, PPI | 78 | 85 | 90 | 23 | 13 | 9 | 1.0 |
| **EARLY ACRE:** | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.5 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 73 | 75 | 91 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 70 | 83 | 93 | 20 | 28 | 21 | 0.6 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.63, PPI | 75 | 78 | 89 | 25 | 28 | 21 | 0.7 |
| **MISSISSIPPI SILVER:** | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.4 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.21, PPI | 78 | 70 | 93 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 0.8 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.42, PPI | 78 | 80 | 86 | 13 | 10 | 4 | 0.3 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.63, PPI | 80 | 85 | 93 | 10 | 8 | 13 | 0.4 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 18 | 18 | 13 | 14 | 17 | 16 | 0.5 |

[a] Evaluations were made 3,6, and 9 wk after PPI applications.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 6. Bensulide study in watermelon, Kibler, 1997**

| | Weed control[a] | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SORHA | | | AMAPA | | | ECLAL | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | |
| **NON-IRRIGATED:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 5.0, PPI | 78 | 28 | 13 | 81 | 38 | 30 | 65 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 6.0, PPI | 68 | 25 | 13 | 88 | 35 | 28 | 60 | 0 | 0 |
| **IRRIGATED:** | | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 5.0, PPI | 70 | 28 | 15 | 58 | 23 | 14 | 78 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 6.0, PPI | 78 | 23 | 13 | 65 | 20 | 6 | 78 | 0 | 0 |
| Ethalfluralin, 1.5, PPI | 83 | 65 | 48 | 70 | 43 | 23 | 83 | 3 | 0 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 14 | 10 | 5 | 20 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 3 | 0 |

**Table 6. Continued.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | | | | | Effect on watermelon | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | ELEIN | | | DIGSA | | | POROL | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk | 2 wk | 2 wk | 4 wk | 8 wk |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | | |
| **NON-IRRIGATED:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 5.0, PPI | 70 | 25 | 15 | 68 | 28 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 6.0, PPI | 70 | 23 | 13 | 68 | 25 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **IRRIGATED:** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 5.0, PPI | 60 | 18 | 11 | 63 | 20 | 13 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bensulide, 6.0, PPI | 75 | 15 | 9 | 73 | 25 | 11 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Ethalfluralin, 1.5, PPI | 73 | 40 | 21 | 65 | 48 | 30 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 12 | 14 | 7 | 13 | 9 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[a] Evaluations were made 2, 4, and 8 wk after emergence.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 7. Watermelon study for yellow nutsedge control, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | Effect on watermelon | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYPES | | | Injury | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | ---------- | ---------- | ---------- | (%) | ---------- | ---------- | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Ethalfluralin, 1.68, PRE hand-weeded | 0 | 0 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Bentazon, 0.84 + COC (Agri-Dex, 1.25% v/v), POST | 0 | 35 | 28 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 15 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.28, PRE | 33 | 58 | 45 | 88 | 15 | 10 | 12 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.039 + WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 85 | 75 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 24 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.018 + WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 84 | 80 | 0 | 20 | 8 | 29 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.027, PRE | 70 | 68 | 35 | 0 | 15 | 5 | 23 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.053, PRE | 80 | 70 | 23 | 13 | 3 | 0 | 22 |
| Bensulide, 6.73, PRE | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 13 | 14 | 28 | 10 | 13 | 8 | 20 |

[a] Evaluations were made 3, 6, and 9 wk after PRE applications. The 6- and 9-wk evaluations correspond to 1 and 3 wk after POST applications.

[b] PPI = preplant incorporated, PRE = preemergence immediately after planting, POST = postemergence over-the-top of foliage.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 8. Cantaloupe study for yellow nutsedge control, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | Effect on cantaloupe | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYPES | | | Injury | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 1 |
| Ethalfluralin, 1.68, PRE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Bentazon, 0.84, COC (Agri-Dex, 1.25%), POST | 0 | 28 | 25 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 4 |
| Sulfentrazone, 0.28, PRE | 55 | 58 | 45 | 53 | 30 | 15 | 2 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.039, WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 83 | 78 | 0 | 18 | 10 | 7 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.019, WA (AG-98, 0.25%), POST | 0 | 78 | 78 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 4 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.027, PRE | 53 | 43 | 30 | 33 | 3 | 0 | 4 |
| Halosulfuron, 0.053, PRE | 45 | 68 | 48 | 55 | 10 | 0 | 3 |
| Bensulide, 6.73, PRE | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 25 | 13 | 15 | 29 | 13 | 9 | 4 |

[a] Evaluations were made 3, 6, and 9 wk after PRE applications. The 6- and 9-wk evaluations correspond to 1 and 4 wk after POST applications.

[b] PRE = preemergence immediately after planting, POST = postemergence over-the-top of foliage.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 9. Primocane suppression in blackberry, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Effect on blackberries[a] | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Injury | | | | | Primocane control | | | | | |
| Treatment description[b] | 1 wk | 2 wk | 3 wk | 4 wk | 5 wk | 1 wk | 2 wk | 3 wk | 4 wk | 5 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4.5 |
| Lactofen, 1.12, POST-DIR1 fb lactofen, 1.12, POST-DIR2 fb lactofen, 1.12, POST-DIR3 | 11 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 65 | 68 | 69 | 63 | 74 | 4.6 |
| Lactofen, 2.24, POST-DIR1 fb lactofen, 2.24, POST-DIR2 fb lactofen, 2.24, POST-DIR3 | 19 | 16 | 21 | 13 | 16 | 85 | 76 | 84 | 83 | 84 | 4.4 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 6 | NS |

[a] Evaluations were made 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 wk after POST-DIR1 applications. The 3-, 4-, and 5-wk evaluations correspond to 1, 2, and 3 wk after POST-DIR2 applications. The 5-wk evaluation also corresponds to 1 wk after POST-DIR3 applications.

[b] POST-DIR = applied postemergence and directed to the base of the crop plant.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 10. Weed control in grapes, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description[b] | Weed control[a] | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CYNDA | | | CMIRA | | | TAROF | | |
| | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate, 3.36, POST-DIR fb glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate 3.36, POST-DIR fb glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate 3.36, POST-DIR | 84 | 95 | 93 | 59 | 68 | 84 | 86 | 89 | 91 |
| Glyphosate, 1.12, POST-DIR fb glyphosate, 1.12, POST-DIR fb glyphosate, 1.12, POST-DIR | 83 | 94 | 98 | 64 | 80 | 88 | 86 | 94 | 96 |
| Paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST fb paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST-DIR fb paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST-DIR | 87 | 91 | 96 | 74 | 63 | 73 | 89 | 89 | 96 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 9 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 8 | 5 | 8 |

**continued**

**Table 10. Continued.**

| Treatment description[b] | Effect on grapes | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Injury | | | Suckers | | | |
| | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | 3 wk | 6 wk | 9 wk | Yield |
| (kg ai/ha) | (%) | | | | | | (mt/ha) |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.35 |
| Glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate, 3.36, POST fb glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate 3.36, as needed fb glufosinate, 1.12 + ammonium sulfate 3.36, as needed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | 93 | 96 | 0.41 |
| Glyphosate, 1.12, POST fb glyphosate, 1.12, as needed fb glyphosate, 1.12, as needed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 | 93 | 95 | 0.53 |
| Paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST fb paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), as needed fb paraquat, 0.56 + AG-98 (0.25%), as needed | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 89 | 93 | 0.39 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 0.1 |

[a] Evaluations were made 3, 6, and 9 wk after the first POST-DIR treatments. The 6- and 9-wk evaluations correspond to 3 and 6 wk after the second POST-DIR treatment. The 9-wk evaluation corresponds to 3 wk after the third POST-DIR application.

[b] POST-DIR = applied postemergence and directed to the base of the crop plant.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 11. Weed control in tomato with rimsulfuron, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | Weed control[a] | | | Effect on tomato | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Treatment description[b] | AMASS | ELEIN | CYPES | Fruit | Weight | Injury |
| (kg ai/ha) | – – – – – – – (%) – – – – – – | | | (no./pl.) | (g/pl.) | (%) |
| Hoed check | 98 | 89 | 88 | 10 | 55.9 | 9 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.035, PRE | 100 | 65 | 89 | 9 | 58.1 | 8 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.017 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 100 | 20 | 89 | 9 | 54.2 | 8 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.026 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 100 | 43 | 87 | 9 | 66.7 | 8 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.035 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 100 | 4 | 83 | 9 | 54.5 | 10 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.035, PRE fb rimsulfuron, 0.017 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 98 | 61 | 83 | 10 | 60.0 | 5 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.035, PRE fb rimsulfuron, 0.026 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 100 | 18 | 91 | 9 | 68.7 | 5 |
| Rimsulfuron, 0.035, PRE fb rimsulfuron, 0.035 + AG-98 (0.25%), POST | 100 | 39 | 85 | 10 | 72.2 | 4 |
| Metribuzin, 0.28 + sethoxydim, 0.21 + COC (1%), POST | 98 | 89 | 88 | 10 | 55.9 | 9 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 6 | 21 | 17 | NS | NS | NS |

[a] Evaluation was made 9 wk after PPI and PRE applications. The 9-wk evaluation corresponds to 4 wk after POST applications.

[b] PRE = preemergence immediately after planting, POST = postemergence over-the-top of foliage.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 12. Mixed cover crop verification in tomatoes, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description | Tomato Fruit | Tomato Avg. Fruit Weight |
|---|---|---|
| | no./plant | g/plant |
| Rye and vetch cover | 10 | 75.0 |
| Black plastic with cover | 10 | 73.0 |
| No cover | 10 | 75.0 |
| LSD (0.05) | NS | NS |

**Table 13. Quinclorac drift simulation on okra, tomato, and bell pepper, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description[b] | Okra | | Pepper | | Tomato | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fruit | Weight | Fruit | Weight | Fruit | Weight |
| (kg ai/ha) | no./pl. | g/pl. | no./pl. | g/pl. | no./pl. | g/pl. |
| Untreated check | 22 | 4.6 | 5 | 30.7 | 10 | 79.8 |
| Quinclorac,1%[a], POST[b] | 30 | 4.7 | 6 | 40.1 | 12 | 70.3 |
| Quinclorac, 0.2%, POST | 23 | 5.0 | 6 | 33.8 | 10 | 65.6 |
| Quinclorac, 0.04%, POST | 21 | 4.8 | 4 | 32.8 | 12 | 65.9 |
| Quinclorac, 0.008%, POST | 26 | 4.9 | 6 | 33.2 | 10 | 78.9 |
| Quinclorac, 0.0016%, POST | 25 | 4.7 | 5 | 35.9 | 13 | 69.5 |
| 2,4-D (amine), 0.2% of 1.12 rate, POST | 22 | 4.6 | 5 | 31.8 | 12 | 72.0 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS | NS |

[a] Percentages refer to the percent of the labeled rate of 0.42 kg/ha quinclorac.
[b] POST = treatments applied postemergence.
[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 14. Evaluation of herbicides for dianthus, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description[b] | Effect on dianthus[a] | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10 DAT | 28 DAT | 56 DAT |
| (kg ai/ha) | ------- (%) ------- | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oryzalin, 2.24, POST-TP | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Oryzalin, 4.49, POST-TP | 15 | 5 | 3 |
| Oryzalin, 8.98, POST-TP | 28 | 5 | 3 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 3.37, POST-TP | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 6.73, POST-TP | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 13.46, POST-TP | 15 | 8 | 8 |
| Oxyfluorfen + pendimethalin, 3.37, POST-TP | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oxyfluorfen + pendimethalin, 6.73, POST-TP | 5 | 5 | 3 |
| Oxyfluorfen + pendimethalin, 13.46, POST-TP | 25 | 10 | 3 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 14 | 10 | 7 |

[a] Evaluations were made 10, 28, and 56 days after treatment.
[b] POST-TP = over-the-top of transplants preemergence to weeds.
[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 15. Evaluation of herbicides for salvia, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description[b] | Effect on salvia[a] | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10 DAT | 28 DAT | 56 DAT |
| (kg ai/ha) | ------- (%) ------- | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dithiopyr, 0.56, POST-TP | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Dithiopyr, 1.12, POST-TP | 23 | 15 | 5 |
| Dithiopyr, 2.24, POST-TP | 25 | 35 | 18 |
| Oryzalin, 2.24, POST-TP | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| Oryzalin, 4.49, POST-TP | 0 | 8 | 10 |
| Oryzalin, 8.98, POST-TP | 0 | 5 | 9 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 3.37, POST-TP | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 6.73, POST-TP | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 13.46, POST-TP | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Prodiamine, 1.68, POST-TP | 5 | 3 | 3 |
| Prodiamine, 3.37, POST-TP | 10 | 13 | 10 |
| Prodiamine, 6.73. POST-TP | 15 | 15 | 13 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 6 | 10 | 11 |

[a] Evaluations were made 10, 28, and 56 days after treatment.
[b] POST-TP = over-the-top of transplants preemergence to weeds.
[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Table 16. Evaluation of herbicides for geranium, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| Treatment description[b] | Effect on geranium[a] | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10 DAT | 28 DAT | 56 DAT |
| (kg ai/ha) | – – – – – – – (%) – – – – – – – | | |
| Untreated check | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Dithiopyr, 0.56, POST-TP | 8 | 8 | 0 |
| Dithiopyr, 1.12, POST-TP | 23 | 28 | 0 |
| Dithiopyr, 2.24, POST-TP | 38 | 35 | 15 |
| Oryzalin, 2,24, POST-TP | 0 | 10 | 3 |
| Oryzalin, 4.49, POST-TP | 15 | 23 | 3 |
| Oryzalin, 8.98, POST-TP | 25 | 25 | 5 |
| Prodiamine, 1.68, POST-TP | 0 | 5 | 3 |
| Prodiamine, 3.37, POST-TP | 0 | 5 | 5 |
| Prodiamine, 6.73, POST-TP | 0 | 15 | 15 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 3.37, POST-TP | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 6.73, POST-TP | 0 | 5 | 0 |
| Oryzalin + oxyfluorfen, 13.46, POST-TP | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| LSD (0.05)[c] | 8 | 11 | 8 |

[a] Evaluations were made 10, 28, and 56 days after treatment.

[b] POST-TP = over-the-top of transplants preemergence to weeds.

[c] LSD values may be used to compare means within the same column.

**Appendix Table 1. Common, trade and chemical names of herbicides used.**

| Designation and trade names | Chemical name and formulation |
|---|---|
| 2,4-D amine (Weedar 64®) | (2,4-dichlorophenoxy)acetic acid, 456 g/L |
| bensulide (Prefar®) | *O*,*O*-bis(1-methylethyl) *S*-[2-[(phenylsulfonyl)amino]ethyl]phosphorodithioate, 480 g/L |
| bentazon (Basagran®) | 3-(1-methylethyl)-(1*H*)-2,1,3-benzothiadiazin-4(3*H*)-one 2,2-dioxide, 480 g/L |
| chlorpropham (Furloe®) | 1-methylethyl 3-chlorophenylcarbamate, 480 g/L |
| clomazone (Command®) | 2-[(2-chlorophenyl)methyl]-4,4-dimethyl-3-isoxazolidinone, 360 g/L |
| clopyralid (Stinger®) | 3,6-dichloro-2-pyridinecarboxylic acid, 360 g/L |
| cycloate (Roneet®) | *S*-ethyl cyclohexylethylcarbamothioate, 720 g/L |
| dimethenamid (Frontier®) | 2-chloro-*N*-[(1-methyl-2-methoxy)ethyl]-N-(2,4-dimethyl-thien-3-yl)-acetamide, 720 g/L |
| dithiopyr (Dimension®) | S,*S*-dimethyl 2-(difluoromethyl)-4-(2-methylpropyl)-6-(trifluoromethyl)-3,5-pyridinedicarbothioate, 25% GR |
| ethalfluralin (Curbit®) | *N*-ethyl-*N*-(2-methyl-2-propenyl)-2,6-dinitro-4-(trifluoromethyl)benzenamine, 360 g/L |
| fluroxypyr (Starane®) | [(4-amino-3,5-dichloro-6-fluoro-2-pyridinyl)oxy]acetic acid, 200 g/L |
| fomesafen (Reflex®, Flexstar®) | 5-[2-chloro-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenoxy]-*N*-(methylsulfonyl)-2-nitrobenzamide, 240 g/L |
| glyphosate (Roundup Ultra®) | *N*-(phosphonomethyl)glycine, 360 g ae/L |
| glufosinate (Finale®) | 2-amino-4-(hydroxymethylphosphinyl)butanoic acid, 120 g/L |
| halosulfuron (Permit®) | 5-[2-chloro-6-fluoro-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenoxy]-*N*-(ethylsulfonyl)-2-nitrobenzamide, 75% W |
| imazethapyr (Pursuit®) | 2-[4,5-dihydro-4-methyl-4-(1-methylethyl)-5-oxo-1*H*-imidazol-2-yl]-5-ethyl-3-pyridinecarboxylic acid, 240 g/L |
| lactofen (Cobra®) | (+)-2-ethoxy-1-methyl-2-oxoethyl 5-[2-chloro-4-(trifluoromethyl)phenoxy]-2-nitrobenzoate, 240 g/L |
| metolachlor (Dual®, Pennant®) | 2-chloro-*N*-(2-ethyl-6-methylphenyl)-*N*-(2-methoxy-1-methylethyl)acetamide, 960 g/L, 936 g/L, 5 G |
| metribuzin (Sencor®) | 4-amino-6-(1,1-dimethylethyl)-3-(methylthio)-1,2,4-triazin-5(4*H*)-one, 75 DF |
| napropamide (Devrinol®) | *N*,*N*-diethyl-2-(1-naphthalenyloxy)propanamide, 50 WP |
| oryzalin (Surflan®) | 4-(dipropylamino)-3,5-dinitrobenzenesulfonamide, 480 g/L |
| oryzalin + oxyfluorfen (Rout®) | see oryzalin and oxyfluorfen |
| oxyfluorfen (component of Rout® and OH II®) | 2-chloro-1-(3-ethoxy-4-nitrophenoxy)-4-(trifluoromethyl)benzene |
| oxyfluorfen + pendimethalin (OH II®) | see oxyfluorfen and pendimethalin, 2 + 1% GR |
| paraquat (Gramoxone Extra®) | 1,1'-dimethyl-4,4'-bipyridinium ion, 300 g/L |

continued

**Appendix Table 1. Continued.**

| Designation and trade names | Chemical name and formulation |
|---|---|
| pendimethalin (component of OH II®) | *N*-(1-ethylpropyl)-3,4-dimethyl-2,6-dinitrobenzenamine |
| phenmedipham (Spin Aid®) | 3-[(methoxycarbonyl)amino]phenyl(3-methylphenyl)carbamate, 156 g/L |
| prodiamine (Barricade®) | 2,4-dinitro-$N^3$,$N^3$-dipropyl-6-(trifluoromethyl)-1,3-benzenediamine, 65% WG |
| quinclorac (Facet®) | 3,7-dichloro-8-quinolinecarboxylic acid, 75% DF |
| quizalofop-P (Assure II®) | (*R*)-2-[4-[(6-chloro-2-quinoxaliny)oxy]phenoxy]propanoc acid, 96 g/L |
| rimsulfuron (Basis ®) | *N*-[[(4,6-dimethoxy-2-pyrimidinyl)amino]carbonyl]-3-(ethylsulfonyl)-2-pyridinesulfon amide, 25 % DF |
| sethoxydim (Poast®) | 2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one, 180 g/L |
| sulfentrazone (Authority®) | *N*-[2,4-dichloro-5-[4-(difluoromethyl)-4,5-dihydro-3-methyl-5-oxo-1*H*-1,2,4-triazol-1-yl]phenyl]methanesulfonamide, 75% DF |
| trifluralin (Treflan®) | 2,6-dinitro-*N*,*N*-dipropyl-4-(trifluoromethyl)benzenamine, 480 g/L |

**Appendix Table 2. Climatological data, Arkansas Agricultural Research and Extension Center, Fayetteville, 1997.**

| | April | | | May | | | June | | | July | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- |
| Day | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall |
| | (ºC) | (ºC) | (cm) | (ºC) | (ºC) | (cm) | (ºC) | (ºC) | (cm) | (ºC) | (ºC) | (cm) |
| Fayetteville | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 7 | 18 | | 3 | 23 | | 9 | 26 | | 22 | 32 | |
| 2 | 11 | 24 | | 14 | 24 | 0.41 | 9 | 24 | | 24 | 32 | |
| 3 | 8 | 23 | | 9 | 18 | | 10 | 23 | | 22 | 32 | |
| 4 | 14 | 20 | 0.05 | 2 | 24 | | 12 | 23 | | 17 | 29 | 0.99 |
| 5 | 12 | 21 | 2.21 | 12 | 27 | | 9 | 24 | 0.03 | 11 | 26 | 0.10 |
| 6 | 6 | 19 | 0.20 | 9 | 27 | | 9 | 28 | | 14 | 27 | |
| 7 | -1 | 17 | | 13 | 25 | | 13 | 29 | | 14 | 29 | |
| 8 | 7 | 14 | 0.89 | 16 | 25 | 1.50 | 13 | 29 | | 20 | 30 | 0.30 |
| 9 | 3 | 14 | 3.20 | 12 | 23 | | 17 | 25 | | 20 | 31 | 0.51 |
| 10 | 5 | 19 | | 2 | 22 | | 17 | 22 | 0.03 | 18 | 27 | 0.33 |
| 11 | 7 | 19 | 1.30 | 5 | 24 | | 16 | 26 | 1.19 | 18 | 31 | |
| 12 | -1 | 6 | 0.13 | 12 | 20 | 0.03 | 17 | 29 | 1.50 | 21 | 32 | |
| 13 | -2 | 11 | | 6 | 23 | | 18 | 27 | 0.79 | 20 | 32 | |
| 14 | -3 | 17 | | 13 | 23 | 0.41 | 15 | 29 | | 21 | 33 | |
| 15 | 0 | 20 | | 9 | 23 | | 16 | 26 | 1.60 | 22 | 34 | |
| 16 | 6 | 16 | 0.33 | 3 | 24 | | 18 | 27 | 1.80 | 21 | 32 | |
| 17 | -1 | 18 | | 10 | 28 | | 17 | 25 | 4.80 | 21 | 32 | |
| 18 | 2 | 25 | | 17 | 29 | | 14 | 29 | 0.03 | 20 | 32 | |
| 19 | 14 | 24 | | 14 | 25 | 0.51 | 17 | 30 | | 19 | 34 | |
| 20 | 8 | 27 | | 11 | 23 | | 22 | 31 | | 18 | 33 | |
| 21 | 12 | 23 | 0.03 | 7 | 23 | | 23 | 30 | | 20 | 33 | |
| 22 | 8 | 18 | 0.20 | 7 | 23 | | 18 | 31 | | 22 | 34 | 0.61 |
| 23 | 6 | 15 | 0.05 | 9 | 23 | | 18 | 30 | | 22 | 26 | 0.03 |
| 24 | 1 | 18 | | 17 | 23 | 0.30 | 21 | 31 | | 21 | 34 | |
| 25 | 7 | 18 | 0.10 | 16 | 27 | 0.20 | 17 | 31 | | 21 | 34 | |
| 26 | 10 | 16 | 0.05 | 21 | 29 | | 16 | 31 | 0.05 | 21 | 35 | |
| 27 | 9 | 13 | 0.89 | 17 | 26 | 1.40 | 19 | 30 | | 21 | 35 | |
| 28 | 7 | 21 | | 13 | 22 | | 20 | 26 | 0.05 | 22 | 36 | |
| 29 | 4 | 24 | | 9 | 25 | | 19 | 28 | | 22 | 30 | 0.89 |
| 30 | 15 | 22 | | 17 | 22 | 1.32 | 18 | 31 | 1.19 | 19 | 28 | |
| 31 | | | | 9 | 23 | | | | | 17 | 29 | |

**Appendix Table 3. Climatological data, Vegetable Substation, Kibler, 1997.**

| | April | | | May | | | June | | | July | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- | Temp. | | Rain- |
| Day | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall | Max | Min | fall |
| | (⁰C) | (⁰C) | (cm) | (⁰C) | (⁰C) | (cm) | (⁰C) | (⁰C) | (cm) | (⁰C) | (⁰C) | (cm) |
| Kibler | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 11 | 21 | | 6 | 25 | | 12 | 28 | | 23 | 34 | |
| 2 | 12 | 26 | | 16 | 28 | 0.03 | 13 | 28 | | 23 | 35 | |
| 3 | 12 | 25 | | 11 | 21 | 0.20 | 14 | 27 | | 24 | 34 | |
| 4 | 13 | 24 | 0.71 | 5 | 24 | | 17 | 26 | | 21 | 33 | 0.05 |
| 5 | 14 | 23 | 3.40 | 10 | 26 | | 16 | 27 | | 16 | 28 | |
| 6 | 9 | 22 | 0.10 | 13 | 29 | | 14 | 29 | | 17 | 27 | |
| 7 | 2 | 19 | | 16 | 27 | | 16 | 32 | | 18 | 31 | |
| 8 | 9 | 18 | 0.20 | 18 | 27 | 0.79 | 17 | 32 | | 22 | 32 | |
| 9 | 7 | 15 | 0.71 | 15 | 26 | 0.79 | 19 | 28 | 0.41 | 23 | 34 | |
| 10 | 5 | 24 | | 6 | 23 | | 19 | 24 | 1.09 | 22 | 32 | |
| 11 | 8 | 23 | 1.09 | 8 | 26 | | 17 | 27 | 0.05 | 22 | 33 | |
| 12 | 2 | 8 | | 14 | 25 | | 18 | 32 | 0.03 | 23 | 34 | |
| 13 | -1 | 12 | | 7 | 28 | | 9 | 31 | 0.71 | 23 | 35 | |
| 14 | 0 | 17 | | 15 | 27 | 0.03 | 18 | 31 | | 23 | 36 | |
| 15 | 4 | 22 | | 13 | 26 | | 21 | 29 | 0.99 | 26 | 35 | |
| 16 | 6 | 22 | | 9 | 26 | | 19 | 29 | 1.32 | 24 | 34 | |
| 17 | 3 | 21 | 0.10 | 13 | 31 | | 20 | 26 | 2.69 | 24 | 34 | |
| 18 | 6 | 26 | | 17 | 32 | | 17 | 31 | 0.03 | 23 | 34 | |
| 19 | 12 | 27 | | 19 | 29 | | 19 | 32 | | 23 | 35 | |
| 20 | 11 | 29 | | 16 | 20 | | 21 | 32 | | 23 | 36 | |
| 21 | 14 | 24 | 0.51 | 14 | 24 | | 23 | 33 | | 23 | 37 | |
| 22 | 13 | 21 | 0.41 | 13 | 24 | | 21 | 33 | | 23 | 36 | |
| 23 | 9 | 19 | 0.30 | 16 | 24 | | 21 | 33 | | 23 | 36 | |
| 24 | 5 | 18 | | 19 | 24 | 0.51 | 22 | 33 | | 23 | 37 | 0.10 |
| 25 | 11 | 17 | | 17 | 29 | 0.71 | 20 | 34 | | 23 | 37 | |
| 26 | 11 | 16 | 0.89 | 21 | 33 | 0.71 | 21 | 33 | | 24 | 37 | |
| 27 | 11 | 14 | 0.79 | 21 | 31 | 0.03 | 21 | 33 | | 24 | 37 | |
| 28 | 9 | 23 | | 16 | 25 | | 21 | 31 | 1.50 | 26 | 38 | |
| 29 | 8 | 26 | | 14 | 28 | | 21 | 28 | 0.08 | 24 | 37 | 2.39 |
| 30 | 14 | 25 | | 19 | 26 | 0.30 | 21 | 33 | 7.39 | 23 | 32 | 0.10 |
| 31 | | | | 15 | 27 | | | | | 20 | 31 | |

**Appendix Table 4. Standardized plant (Bayer) codes, Weed Science Society of America, for weeds appearing in this report.**

| Code | Scientific Name | Common Name |
|---|---|---|
| AMAPA | *Amaranthus palmeri* S. Wats. | Palmer amaranth |
| AMASS | *Amaranthus* spp. | pigweed species |
| CAPBP | *Capsella bursa-pastoris* L. | shepherdspurse |
| CHEAL | *Chenopodium album* L. | common lambsquarters |
| CMIRA | *Campsis radicans* (L.) seem. ex Bureau | trumpetcreeper |
| CYNDA | *Cynodon dactylon* (L.) Pers. | bermudagrass |
| CYPES | *Cyperus esculentus* L. | yellow nutsedge |
| DIGSA | *Digitaria sanguinalis* (L.) Scop. | large crabgrass |
| ECLAL | *Eclipta prostrata* L. | eclipta |
| ELEIN | *Eleusine indica* (L.) Gaertn. | goosegrass |
| LAMAM | *Lamium amplexicaule* L. | henbit |
| LOLMU | *Lolium multiflorum* Lam. | Italian ryegrass |
| POANN | *Poa annua* L. | annual bluegrass |
| POROL | *Portulaca oleracea* L. | common purslane |
| SIBVI | *Sibara virginica* (L.) Rollins | sibara |
| SORHA | *Sorghum halepense* (L.) Pers. | johnsongrass |
| TAROF | *Taraxacum officinale* Weber in Wiggers | dandelion |

**Conversion Table**

| U.S. to Metric | | | Metric to U.S. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| to convert from | to | multiply U.S. unit by | to convert from | to | multiply metric unit by |
| length | | | length | | |
| miles | kilometers | 1.61 | kilometers | miles | .62 |
| yards | meters | .91 | meters | yards | 1.09 |
| feet | meters | .31 | meters | feet | 3.28 |
| inches | centimeters | 2.54 | centimeters | inches | .39 |
| area and volume | | | area and volume | | |
| sq yards | sq meters | .84 | sq meters | sq yards | 1.20 |
| sq feet | sq meters | .09 | sq meters | sq feet | 10.76 |
| sq inches | sq centimeters | 6.45 | sq centimeters | sq inches | .16 |
| cu inches | cu centimeters | 16.39 | cu centimeters | cu inches | .06 |
| acres | hectares | .41 | hectares | acres | 2.47 |
| liquid measure | | | liquid measure | | |
| cu inches | liters | .02 | liters | cu inches | 61.02 |
| cu feet | liters | 28.34 | liters | cu feet | .04 |
| gallons | liters | 3.79 | liters | gallons | .26 |
| quarts | liters | .95 | liters | quarts | 1.06 |
| fluid ounces | milliliters | 29.57 | milliliters | fluid ounces | .03 |
| weight and mass | | | weight and mass | | |
| pounds | kilograms | .45 | kilograms | pounds | 2.21 |
| ounces | grams | 28.35 | grams | ounces | .04 |
| temperature | | | temperature | | |
| F | C | 5/9(F-32) | C | F | 9/5(C+32) |

UofA
UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
DIVISION OF AGRICULTURE