

Winter annual weed control with fall and spring applied herbicides. Spotanski, Jess J., and Alex R. Martin. A field study was conducted to evaluate the efficacy of herbicide programs in no-tillage systems. A randomized complete block design with three replications per treatment was utilized. The study was conducted on a Sharpsburg silt loam with 2.4% organic matter and a pH of 6.9. Individual plots consisted of six 30-inch rows, each 30 feet long. Treatments were applied with a tractor-mounted sprayer traveling 3.0 mph. Application, weed, and weather data are presented:

| Date | November 15 | April 17 |
|-------------------------------|-------------|-----------|
| Treatment | FALL | SPRING |
| Sprayer | | |
| gpa | 15 | 15 |
| psi | 30 | 30 |
| Temperature (°F) | | |
| Air | 77 | 70 |
| Soil (4 inch) | 66 | 63 |
| Soil Moisture | Dry | Moist |
| Wind (mph) | 8 | 5 |
| Sky (% cloudy) | 10 | 0 |
| Relative Humidity (%) | 35 | 33 |
| Precip. after appl. | | |
| Week 1 (inch) | 0.0 | 0.75 |
| Week 2 (inch) | 1.52 | 1.45 |
| Henbit | | |
| Stage | 2-8 leaf | flowering |
| Height (cm) | 1-7 | 8-10 |
| Infestation (m ²) | 1500 | 1000 |
| Tansy mustard | | |
| Stage | rosette | flowering |
| Height (cm) | 0-2 | 22-28 |
| Infestation (m ²) | 0-50 | 0-10 |

Summary comments: All treatments, with the exception of flumioxazin alone, provided excellent control of the winter annual weeds. There was, though, a slight advantage to applying the treatments in the fall over the spring. Some of the fall applied treatments showed little activity in the weeks after application, but in the spring, the treatments had excellent weed control. Results of the study are summarized in the following table (Dept. of Agronomy and Horticulture, University of Nebraska-Lincoln).

Table. Winter annual weed control with fall and spring applied herbicides (Spotanski and Martin).

| Treatment | Application | | -----LAMAM----- | | | | -----DESPI----- | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-----|------|-----------------|-------|-----|------|
| | Rate (lb/a) | Timing | 11/30 | 12/15 | 4/9 | 5/14 | 11/30 | 12/15 | 4/9 | 5/14 |
| -----% weed control----- | | | | | | | | | | |
| Flumioxazin+ COC ¹ | 0.063 1 pt | Fall | 7 | 50 | 50 | 3 | 13 | 95 | 90 | 7 |
| Flumioxazin+ atrazine+ COC | 0.063 1.0 1 pt | Fall | 10 | 47 | 100 | 100 | 20 | 95 | 80 | 85 |
| Flumioxazin+ 2,4-D+ COC | 0.063 0.33 1 pt | Fall | 18 | 73 | 100 | 100 | 37 | 97 | 95 | 89 |
| Atrazine+ COC | 1.0 1 pt | Fall | 10 | 12 | 100 | 100 | 20 | 95 | 92 | 95 |
| s-metolachlor&CGA-154281& atrazine+ COC | 1.5 1.94 1 qt | Fall | 10 | 13 | 100 | 100 | 20 | 95 | 98 | 99 |
| s-metolachlor&CGA-154281& atrazine+ COC | 1.8 2.33 1 qt | Fall | 10 | 10 | 100 | 100 | 20 | 95 | 100 | 99 |
| s-metolachlor&CGA-154281& atrazine+ COC | 1.5 1.94 1 qt | Spring | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| Glyphosate ² + AMS ³ | 1.0 2.55 | Spring | 0 | 0 | 0 | 83 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 98 |
| Glyphosate& atrazine& acetochlor+ AMS | 0.37 1.0 1.31 1.3 | Spring | 0 | 0 | 0 | 97 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| Glyphosate ⁴ + flumetsulam+ 2,4-D+ AMS+ NIS ⁵ | 0.75 0.05 0.5 2.55 0.25% | Fall | 10 | 70 | 100 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Flumetsulam+ 2,4-D+ COC | 0.05 0.5 1% | Fall | 10 | 72 | 99 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Glyphosate ⁴ + 2,4-D+ AMS+ NIS | 0.75 0.5 2.55 0.25% | Fall | 13 | 72 | 99 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 93 | 100 |
| Flumetsulam+ metribuzin+ 2,4-D+ NIS | 0.05 0.188 0.5 0.25% | Fall | 18 | 25 | 99 | 100 | 28 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | | | 4 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 7 |

¹COC = 'Prime Oil' by Agrilliance

²glyphosate = 'Roundup UltraMax'

³AMS = 'N Pa K' by Agrilliance

⁴glyphosate = 'Glyphomax Plus'

⁵NIS = 'Preference' by Agrilliance