CERTIFIED CROP ADVISER

CCA ADVANTAGE

The Voice of the Certified Crop Adviser Program
www.agronomy.org/cca

CCA News and Updates

The Louisiana CCA Board (l to r) J. Stevens, Mike Venable, Marty Pousson, CCA's Executive Director Luther Smith, Fran Deville and John Fontane.

The Louisiana CCA Board met in January with Executive Director Luther Smith to discuss program opportunities. On their agenda was the need to enhance educational opportunities for CCAs. Items discussed included joint meetings with other similar organizations including other CCA boards. This could involve bringing experts from other parts of the country or world to discuss pertinent topics that apply to Louisiana agriculture. Soybean rust is one of the more timely topics.

The board would like to collaborate with other CCA boards. They discussed an exchange type program with other CCA boards so that members could experience agriculture in other parts of the country. It would provide the opportunity to share ideas on what other CCA boards are doing to serve the CCAs in their areas. This could also be expanded to CCAs for educational opportunities.

Communication efforts will also be expanded to include a Louisiana CCA Web site that will be linked to the ASA/CCA Web site. **John Fontane** is in the process of collecting all of the CCAs' e-mail addresses so the board can communicate directly with CCAs on a more timely basis. The ASA/CCA office in Madison will be assisting with these efforts.

The meeting concluded with a renewed enthusiasm and commitment to the CCAs in Louisiana. If you have interest in serving on the Louisiana CCA Board or contributing to the efforts, please contact John Fontane, *jmbfon@cox-internet.com*, 337/277-1668, or Luther Smith, *lsmith@agronomy.org*, 608/268-4977.

ASA Calls for Award Nominees

The American Society of Agronomy (ASA) is now accepting nominations for a number of awards for which CCAs may be eligible. Membership in the ASA is not required for nominees. Honorariums for award recipients range from $500 to $5,000. Nominations are due May 2, 2005, and reference letters are due May 9, 2005. For more information, go to *www.AgProfessional.com* and access the CCA link. Click on: General Info and Promotional Materials.

Ingrid Kristjanson, left, is presented the Canadian Prairie Provinces 2004 CCA of the Year by Harold Schmaltz, representing the Canadian Fertilizer Institute. On the right is Eric Gregory, CCA, Manitoba representative of the Prairie CCA Board.

Ingrid Kristjanson, an agricultural representative for Manitoba Agriculture, Food and Rural Initiatives (MAFRI), is the Prairie Provinces 2004 Certified Crop Adviser (CCA) of the Year. The Canadian Fertilizer Institute (CFI) sponsors the award.

Kristjanson has been a CCA since 1997, the first year the CCA exam session was offered in Manitoba. She was an agronomist at Simplot at the time and then worked for Cargill before becoming the agricultural representative in Morris with MAFRI in 2002. Her areas of interest include soil testing and increasing awareness and interpretation of lab analysis.

In 2003 she recognized a need for timely dissemination of agronomic information to clients and colleagues to help growers make the best decisions. She partnered with a local producer organization and secured external funding for a newsletter, *The Valley Update*. It is mailed weekly throughout the growing season (twice a week during crucial phases) to every farm client, agri-business and chemical company representative in her Agricultural Representative District.

USDA Announces New Conservation Technical Assistance Policy

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Chief Bruce Knight has released a new comprehensive policy for operating the Conservation Technical Assistance Program (CTA).

The new CTA policy establishes national priorities for the program. This year, priorities focus on helping farmers and ranchers comply more easily with environmental regulatory burdens and are consistent with the national priorities already established for the Environmental Quality Incentives Program. Resetting these priorities establishes the importance of CTA in supporting the president's Management Agenda and increases the program's effectiveness and efficiency.

Additional information is on the Web at *http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/cta*.

CCA AGREES NATIONAL PRIORITIES ARE HELPFUL

"The new CTA policy should help make NRCS more effective and efficient by using national priorities," reports **Luther Smith**, CCA executive director. It should also help improve consistency between states, realizing there will still be local priorities but supporting a national priority.

NRCS released five national priorities for FY 2005 for conservation planning and implementation using CTA Program assistance:

- CNMP planning to help the owners and operators of animal feeding operations to address their conservation needs, with an emphasis on helping those owners and operators who need to comply under the EPA's Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation Rule.
- Reduction of non-point source pollution, such as nutrients, sediment, pesticides or excess salinity in impaired watersheds, consistent with TMDLs where available, as well as the reduction in ground water contamination and the conservation of ground and surface water resources.
- Reduction of emissions, such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides, volatile organic compounds and ozone precursors and depletes that contribute to air quality impairment violations of National Ambient Air quality Standards.
- Reduction in soil erosion and sedimentation from unacceptable levels on agricultural land.
- Promotion of at-risk species habitat conservation.

CCA Endorses the Landcare US Initiative

Luther Smith
Exec. Director
CCA

Mike Brubaker
CEO
Landcare US

The Certified Crop Adviser Program (CCA) has joined forces with a community conservation movement that began in Australia in 1986 and recently expanded to the United States. Landcare Australia began with farming neighbors working with conservationists to address environmental concerns. Today, over 4,000 local Landcare groups participate in natural resource management projects and a survey found that 85 percent of Australians recognize Landcare Australia's "caring hands" logo.

The Australian experience demonstrated that broad public awareness and involvement in the protection and conservation of natural resources can be achieved. In the U.S. private citizens, businesses and agencies make enormous investments in conservation. Yet, extensive public participation spanning interrelated urban, suburban and rural environments is still missing.

Landcare US uses a "middle-of-the-road" approach to bridge the gap across competing interests. It is highly collaborative and seeks to spotlight the efforts of local groups and match corporate sponsors with local projects. It is not interested in purchasing deeds to land or in litigation.

Joining in the CCA's endorsement of Landcare US are the American Society of Agronomy, Crop Science Society of America and Soil Science Society of America (ASA-CSSA-SSSA). This endorsement adds to a list of national organizations that have previously endorsed Landcare US including the Conservation Technology Information Center, National Association of Conservation Districts, National Association of Regional Councils, National Association of Resource Conservation and Development Councils, and the National Corn Growers Association.

Landcare's collaborative abilities were recently demonstrated when 30 organizations were pulled together in a project designed to highlight U.S. watersheds. The resulting map can be viewed at *www.landcareus.org*.

Luther Smith, associate executive vice president of ASA-CSSA-SSSA and executive director of the CCA Program, says, "This will be a very proactive environmental stance for our members and fits our strategic plan to bring more environmental and agronomic information to the general public. We are very pleased to be part of this alliance and supportive of a conservation movement that has a notable track record."

Learn more about Landcare US at *www.landcareus.org* or contact **Mike Brubaker**, executive director, CEO, Council for US Landcare Initiative, Inc., at 717/627-1043.

Updates From the Nation's Capitol on Issues of Interest to CCAs

By Karl Glasener
Director of Science Policy, ASA-CSSA-SSA
ph: 202/408-5382
e-mail: karlglasener@cs.com

HOUSE AND SENATE AG COMMITTEES TO BEGIN FARM BILL ACTIVITY IN 2006

On Jan. 27, House Agriculture Chairman **Goodlatte** reported plans to initiate hearings on the next farm bill this year and continue them in 2006 with the goal of finishing in early 2007. His announcement raises the question of whether there will be pressure on Congress to finish the bill before 2006 elections.

The current 2002 Farm Bill was set in place to cover the period through the 2007 crop year. Sections of it expire at different times, depending on the planting, growing and harvesting period for various crops. The decision to begin work early led the Senate Agriculture Committee to announce plans to commit funds during the second half of FY05 ($2.1 million) and FY06 ($3.7 million) for hearings both in Washington and around the country in preparation for the bill.

GOOD NEWS FOR CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

In the 2006 budget, the administration is requesting $274 million for the Conservation Security Program (CSP), a 35 percent increase. During the first year of enrollment in 2004, USDA signed long-term CSP contracts with 2,200 farmers and ranchers in 18 priority watersheds around the country. In 2005 the USDA will enlarge the program by offering enrollment opportunities in about 200 watersheds, and in 2006 the budget anticipates that USDA will continue to expand the program by delivering it in an additional 200 watersheds. The CSP rewards farmers and ranchers for their existing levels of conservation and provides incentives for them to enhance their environmental stewardship. The budget also includes an increase of $37 million to provide more conservation technical assistance to livestock producers to comply with environmental regulations. With this additional funding, NRCS will work with farmers to develop 3,800 comprehensive nutrient management plans and apply nutrient management on over 470,000 acres of agricultural land.

LIMITS ON FARM SUBSIDY PAYMENTS PROPOSED

In mid-February, Senate Finance Chairman **Charles Grassley** (R-IA) and Sen. **Byron Dorgan** (D-ND) introduced legislation that would lower limits on farm subsidy payments in an attempt to benefit family farmers. Coming after a year-long Government Accountability Office study that discovered systemic abuses of USDA regulations in which many large farming operations were allowed to circumvent payment limits, the bill proposes to shore up these loopholes. Joined by representatives of organizations supporting the bill, the senators cited data demonstrating that of the farms that qualify for payments, a relatively small number, mainly corporation- and large partnership-owned operations, receive most of the benefits. A similar proposal was made by the senators during debate on the 2002 Farm Bill, but it was dropped before the bill passed. Coincidentally, President Bush's FY06 budget request proposes 5 percent cuts for crop and dairy subsidies. The budget also limits the maximum subsidy a farmer can receive to $250,000 and reduces farmers' marketing loans. As published by the Environmental Working Group, spending on farm subsidies was as follows: 1995, $4.7 billion; 2000, $20.4 billion; and 2003, $11.5 billion.

JOHANNS ADDRESSES KEY ISSUES AT HEARING

On Jan. 14 **Mike Johanns**, Agriculture Secretary-designate, passed through his nomination hearing. He faced some tough questioning from Senate Agriculture Committee members who made it clear that the issues discussed will be seen again.

In his opening statement, Johanns laid out his priorities, emphasizing biotechnology and value-added agriculture, ethanol use and new markets. His emphasis on the need for states and USDA to cooperate on the use of surplus nonfat dry milk didn't appear to impress senators, since farmers have criticized it as minor when contrasted with the scope of the problem. Conspicuously absent was his view on the 2002 Farm Bill.

During the hearing, Sen. **Ben Nelson** (D-NE) asked Johanns to reconsider the rule that forbids slaughtering "downer" cattle. Johanns replied that he approved of the USDA 2003 decision to exclude meat from downer cattle from the human food supply. However, he might reconsider after 250,000 U.S. cattle have been tested for mad cow disease.

Freshman Sen. **Ken Salazar** (D-CO) asked for his position on mandatory country-of-origin labeling. Johanns responded that he would adopt President Bush's position that voluntary country-of-origin labeling of red meat and other products is preferable to mandated labeling.

Senate Agriculture ranking member **Tom Harkin** (D-IA) asked Johanns to review Conservation Security Program (CSP) rules and payments to ensure farmers are attracted to the program. Sen. **Mark Dayton** (MN-D) asked Johanns to ensure the maintenance of a budget large enough that farmers who have idled land in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) can renew contracts that expire this year. Sen. **Debbie Stabenow** (MI-D) requested that Johanns review USDA interpretation of fruit and vegetable provisions in the farm bill. Johanns responded that he would adopt the administration's positions.

American Society of Agronomy members can find updates on these and other issues in the Science Policy Action Alert at *http://capwiz.com/acs/home.*

Impact of Planter Type, Planting Speed, and Tillage on Stand Uniformity and Yield of Corn

By Weidong Liu, Matthijs Tollenaar, Greg Stewart and William Deen

EARN ONE CEU!
All CCAs may earn up to 20 Continuing Education Units (CEUs) per two-year cycle as board-approved self-study articles which will include CCA Advantage articles. The CCA CEU logo (above) marks all pre-approved material, with the CEU value indicated by the number in the middle. To receive one CEU in crop management, read this article, fill out the attached exam and mail the tear-out form, along with $10, to the American Society of Agronomy.

Spacing uniformity, timing and rate of emergence, and plant population in a corn stand are the most common characteristics used by producers in evaluating planter performance. Planter mechanisms and maintenance along with planting speed may all influence seed singulation and placement and can further affect plant spacing and emergence variability in corn. Such variability may ultimately affect plant growth and grain yield.

The effect of within-row plant spacing variability on grain yield is somewhat unclear. Various studies have demonstrated a corn yield reduction associated with spacing variability, whereas other studies indicate that spacing variability commonly observed in many commercial fields will not reduce grain yield if plant population is adequate. In contrast, uneven emergence almost always reduces grain yield, with early-emerged plants unable to compensate for the lower yield of late-emerging plants.

Excessive planting speeds can alter seeding rates, increase stand establishment variability and consequently decrease grain yield. Increasing planting speed increased the standard deviation (SD) of plant spacing by 0.4 to 0.6 cm kph^{-1} (kilometers per hour) and yield losses of 78 kg ha^{-1} kph^{-1} in planting speed in the range of 6.4 to 11.3 kph were observed in a study in 1995. The effect did not consistently occur, with only five out of 22 sites demonstrating this relationship. It was concluded in this study that future research on the effect of planting speed on grain yield should measure the effects on emergence uniformity because faster planting speeds can decrease uniformity of seeding depth and seed-to-soil contact, causing uneven emergence.

Previous research has examined the mean response of commonly used planters to planting speed and generally has ignored the possible differences of individual planters with differing mechanisms. In addition, no data have been published to determine if planter performance is the same in reduced tillage systems compared with conventional tillage (CT) systems or whether there are interactions between planter and tillage system and between planter and planting speed. A comparison of planter performance under different tillage systems and at different planting speeds may assist growers in improving planter performance, thereby increasing yield and economic returns. More practically, it may assist growers in evaluating corn planter requirements before retrofitting or replacing existing planters.

The objectives of this study were to (1) determine if planter type affects corn growth and grain yield by altering plant spacing and emergence variability and (2) assess whether plant-spacing and emergence variability resulting from various planter types is influenced by planting speed and tillage management.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiments were conducted in 2000 and 2001 at the Elora Research Station and the Woodstock Research Station in south-central Ontario, Canada. A mean accumulation of 2,650 crop heat units occurred during the growing season at Elora, and 2,850 crop heat units occurred at Woodstock. At Elora, the London loam soil is an imperfectly drained medium, mixed, weakly to moderately calcareous Typic Hapludalf with tile drainage and an organic matter content of 38 to 40 g kg^{-1}. The Guelph loam soil at Woodstock is a well-drained medium, mixed, alkaline, moderately to very strongly calcareous Typic Hapludalf with 20 to 30 g kg^{-1} organic matter.

Experimental design was a split-split plot arrangement of a randomized complete block with four replicates of each treatment. Two tillage systems were main plots, three types of planter were subplots, and two levels of planting speed were sub-subplots. Each sub-subplot consisted of four rows in 0.76-m row spacing and 25 m in length. Each main plot was bordered by eight rows. The two tillage systems were CT and no-till (NT). The CT treatments consisted of spring moldboard plowing to a depth of 16 cm followed by one or two cultivations before planting. In both years, the previous crop was alfalfa at Elora and soybeans at Woodstock.

Three planters were chosen to represent the range in planter technologies currently available to corn growers in Ontario. For the purpose of description, the three planters are referred to as (1) vacuum meter, (2) finger pickup and (3) air seeder. The vacuum meter was a John Deere 1750 MaxEmerge Plus planter that was manufactured in 1998 and equipped with a double-disk opener system, 2.5-cm-wide angled closing wheels, fingered residue removers attached in front of the furrow opener, three coulters set at a 10- to 15-cm depth and seed firmers. The finger-pickup planter was a John Deere 7000 planter manufactured in 1986 with similar components as the vacuum meter planter, except for the absence of seed firmers. The air seeder was a Gandy Orbit-Air 6224 air seeder manufactured in 1990. Unlike the previous two planters, this planter has no precision-metering device. Seed metering is achieved using a ground-driven revolving seed drum that delivers seed from the central hopper to delivery tubes to each seed furrow. Furrow opening is achieved by a single disc and furrow closing by a single angled closing wheel. No residue removers, coulters or seed firmers were on this planter.

All planters were adjusted to plant at a depth of 4 to 5 cm, a row width of 76 cm and a target population of 71,500 plants ha^{-1}. The two planting-speed treatments of 7.2 and 11.3 kph were chosen to represent low and high speeds used by farmers in Ontario.

Corn was planted on May 30, 2000, and May 9, 2001, at Elora and May 22, 2000, and May 1, 2001, at Woodstock. Roundup Ready corn hybrids DK335 and DK C42-21RR were used at Elora and Woodstock, respectively. Urea NH_4NO_3, at a rate of 150 kg N ha^{-1}, was injected between rows at approximately four to five weeks after planting. Glyphosate was sprayed five to six weeks after planting for weed control.

Corn emergence was recorded by daily counting the number of emerged plants in two central rows of each sub-subplot starting seven days after planting and continuing for 20 days. Within-row plant spacing was measured for 120 consecutive plants in the center two rows of each sub-subplot at two weeks after silking. Within-row plant-spacing variability was determined by calculating the plant-spacing SD. Number of days from planting to 50% plant emergence was calculated.

Plant samples were taken at six and 12 weeks after planting. At both sampling dates, the above-ground biomass of 10 consecutive plants in each plot was harvested from a pre-marked sampling area that was bordered by two rows on each side and by six plants within the row on each end. Green leaf area of all harvested plants was measured. The leaves and stems of sample plants were dried at 80°C for 72 hours before measurement of plant dry matter. At maturity, ears were hand-harvested from 6 m of the two center rows. Grain yield was adjusted to a 15.5% moisture basis. Final plant population, number of broken stalks, and number of double and barren ears were determined from the harvest area.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Treatment effects were significant for most measured characters, and these effects generally were similar across years in combined variance analysis. Monthly mean air temperatures for both years were close to the 30-year average. Monthly precipitation was above the 30-year average in 2000 and below in 2001. Interactions between tillage treatment and location mostly were insignificant in combined analysis. Tillage had significant effects on all measurements. At Woodstock, feeding by wild animals caused significant damage in six plots in one replication in 2000. Also at Woodstock, several of the air seeder plots had very low populations (less than 75% of the target population) in 2001, presumably due to poor furrow closing. Yields and other data from those plots were eliminated from the analysis.

The vacuum meter produced the lowest SD, and the air seeder produced the highest SD. For the air seeder, SD was approximately two times higher than for the other two planters. The air seeder used in this study did not possess a seed-singulating mechanism, and consequently higher SD levels were expected.

In general, for all planters, SD increased as planting speed increased. The effect of planting speed on SD was greatest for the finger pickup and the air seeder under NT. Averaged over all locations and years, SD increased from 10.0 to 12.2 cm for the finger pickup and from 19.3 to 21.8 cm for the air seeder as speed increased from 7.2 to 11.3 kph under NT. Standard deviation increased an average of 0.4 cm per kilometer increase in planting speed, a value similar to that reported in an earlier study.

Tillage system had a greater impact on SD of the finger pickup and air seeder than the vacuum meter. Averaged over the location, year, and planting speed, SD increased from 9.5 cm and 19.2 cm under CT to 11.1 cm and 20.6 cm under NT for the finger pickup and the air seeder, respectively. In comparison, SD levels for the vacuum meter were similar under both CT and NT systems. The singulating mechanism used in the vacuum meter appeared to be less affected by increased jarring of the planting unit often associated with either higher planting speeds or NT conditions.

While initial corn emergence occurred on the same day for all treatments, cumulative emergence patterns, as indicated by days to 50% corn emergence, were affected by planter type and tillage. Among the three planters, the number of days required to achieve 50% emergence was similar between the vacuum meter and finger-pickup planter but differed between these two planters and the air seeder. Under CT, planting speed did not affect the emergence pattern produced by the vacuum planter or finger pickup planter. The emergence delay observed for the air seeder was probably due to poor depth control and the inability of the single closing wheel to adequately close the seed furrow.

The number of days required to achieve 50% emergence for NT was approximately 1.5 days greater than for CT. This difference was increased when planting speed was increased or when the air seeder was used. The longer time taken by corn in NT treatments to emerge may have been associated with lower soil temperature in the NT vs. the CT treatments.

Final plant population between tillage systems differed, but population was unaffected by planter type and planting speed treatment within a tillage system. When averaged across all locations and years, mean plant population was 72,670 plants ha^{-1} for CT and 70,730 plants ha^{-1} for NT.

Leaf area index (LAI) and above-ground dry matter differed between both tillage systems and among the three planters but not between low and high planting speeds. For example, averaged across planters and planting speed, mean LAI and dry matter measured 12 weeks after planting were both 18% lower in NT than in CT. Averaged across tillage and planting speed, LAI and dry matter accumulation were consistently highest for the vacuum meter and lowest for the air seeder at the two locations. Compared with the vacuum meter, mean dry matter accumulation was 14% and 10% lower for the finger-pickup planter and 36% and 14% lower for the air seeder at six and 12 weeks after planting, respectively.

Planter types and tillage systems differed in mean grain yield, and a tillage x planter interaction occurred. Averaged across all locations and years, grain yield was 7.41, 7.17 and 6.80 Mg ha^{-1} for the vacuum planter, finger-pickup planter and air seeder, respectively. Grain yield was lower in NT than in CT. Averaged over all locations and years, NT yielded 7, 8, and 15% lower than CT for the vacuum meter, finger pickup and air seeder, respectively. Averaged across locations, years and planting speeds, yield differences between air seeder and the other two planters were greater in NT than in CT. In CT, the finger pickup and air seeder produced 0.24 and 0.34 Mg ha^{-1} lower yield than the vacuum meter, respectively. In the NT system, the finger pickup and air seeder yielded 0.26 and 0.90 Mg ha^{-1} lower than the vacuum meter, respectively. Planting speed had no effect on grain yield at both locations with an exception for the air seeder under NT management. Averaged across locations and years, yield declined 0.41 Mg ha^{-1} when planting speed increased from 7.2 to 11.3 kph.

Regression analyses indicated that grain yield reductions were related to greater within-row plant spacing variability and delays in emergence. Yield decreased approximately 35.9 kg ha^{-1} for each centimeter increase in within-row plant spacing SD in the range of SD from 6.5 to 23.9 cm. Two previous studies suggested that grain yield is unaffected by the plant-spacing SD within rows, but the SD values in these studies ranged from 6.7 to 16.2 cm and 2.5 to 17.5 cm, respectively. In the present study, grain yield response may be due to the large within-row plant spacing SD (6.5 to 23.9 cm) produced by the air seeder treatment, which was two to three times higher than observed for the other two planters. With vacuum meter and finger-pickup planters, grain yield was unaffected by the SD values for within-row plant spacing.

Results of the present study confirm previous research findings on emergence delay effects on grain yield. Yield decreased 292.8 kg ha^{-1} d^{-1} whenever the time to 50% emergence was delayed by >3 days across the three planters. The number of days required to achieve 50% emergence was 1.5 to 2 days greater with the air seeder than the other two planters. Differences were accentuated when planting speed was increased.

Grain yield was lower with the air seeder than the vacuum meter in both tillage systems. In CT, the air seeder produced similar yield as the finger pickup. However, the air seeder produced lower yields than the finger pickup in NT and also yielded lower under high planting speed than low planting speed.

SUMMARY

The three planters evaluated in this study were chosen to be representative of the range of planting technologies currently available to Ontario growers. The vacuum meter represents a well-maintained planter with the most current technology for ensuring accurate seed singulation and placement. The air seeder represents a planter with poor seed singulation and placement capabilities. The finger-pickup planter represents a commonly used planter with intermediate seed singulation and placement capabilities.

The results of this study suggest that grower attention to planter mechanisms and maintenance becomes more critical under NT or when operating speeds are increased. Overall performance on plant spacing uniformity was in the order of vacuum meter > finger pickup > air seeder. The vacuum meter and finger-pickup planter produced an equivalent within-row plant spacing SD when operated under CT at a planting speed of 7.2 kph. However, under NT or at the higher planting speed, SD increased with the finger-pickup planter whereas SD remained stable with the vacuum meter planter. Emergence patterns did not differ between the vacuum meter and finger-pickup planter, whereas emergence was delayed when the air seeder was used. In general, the planter that produced the lowest within-row plant spacing SD and the most uniform emergence also achieved the highest LAI, dry matter accumulation and yield.

The air seeder used in this study could be modified so as to improve performance. Ontario growers are interested in the possibility of using this type of planter since it would enable them to plant all crops of a typical Ontario crop rotation (i.e., corn, soybeans and cereals) using a single planter. However, results from this study would suggest that this type of planter is probably not advisable for corn unless planting conditions are ideal and planting occurs at low operating speeds. If these conditions do not occur, the air-seeding system will probably need to be equipped with devices to improve seed singulation and placement.

Editor's note: *Content was adapted from the paper "Impact of Planter Type, Planting Speed, and Tillage on Stand Uniformity and Yield of Corn," which was published in Agronomy Journal, Vol. 96, November-December 2004, and is courtesy of the authors Weidong Liu, Matthijs Tollenaar, Greg Stewart and William Deen.*

CCA 1 CEU

Continuing Education Self-Study Course

Crop Management

Get a CEU!

This exam is worth 1 CEU in **Crop Management**. An exam score of 70% or higher will earn CEU credit. The International CCA program has approved self-study CEUs for 20 of the 40 CEUs required in the two-year cycle.

DIRECTIONS

1. Read the self-study article on pages 56-58 carefully.
2. Answer the questions by clearly marking an "X" in the box next to the best answer for each question.
3. Complete the self-study exam registration form on the back of this page.
4. Clip out this self-study examination page, fold and place in envelope.
5. Enclose a check for $10.00 made payable to the American Society of Agronomy, for processing fees. Payment in U.S. funds only.
6. **Mail your self-study exam and fee to:** ASA c/o CCA Self-Study Exam, 677 S. Segoe Road, Madison, WI 53711. *Please allow 60 days for processing.*
7. An electronic version of this test is also available at *www.AgProfessional.com*. Go to the Certified Crop Advisers section (lefthand column) and access the "CCA Advantage" link.

DETACH HERE

Impact of Planter Type, Planting Speed, and Tillage on Stand Uniformity and Yield of Corn

March Self-Study Examination

1. Within-row plant spacing variability:

[ ] a. conclusively results in a reduction in corn yield.
[ ] b. has no correlation with corn yield.
[ ] c. may only cause corn yield reductions when spacing variability is very high.
[ ] d. effect on corn yield is too difficult to determine.

2. Uneven emergence:

[ ] a. has no effect on grain yield.
[ ] b. almost always reduces grain yield.
[ ] c. is directly proportional to plant spacing.
[ ] d. will not affect grain yield as long as the plant population is adequate.

3. Faster planting speeds:

[ ] a. can increase seeding depth uniformity.
[ ] b. can enhance seed-to-soil contact.
[ ] c. can ensure uniform plant emergence.
[ ] d. can cause uneven emergence.

4. For this study, the soil type at both of the Canadian research stations was a:

[ ] a. Typic Hapludalf.
[ ] b. Typic Hapludoll.
[ ] c. Typic Boralf.
[ ] d. Typic Boroll.

5. The effect of planting speed on standard deviation (SD) was greatest for the:

[ ] a. finger pickup and the air seeder under CT.
[ ] b. finger pickup and the air seeder under NT.
[ ] c. vacuum meter and the air seeder under CT.
[ ] d. vacuum meter and the air seeder under NT.

6. Tillage system had a greater impact on standard deviation:

[ ] a. on the vacuum meter and air seeder than on the finger pickup.
[ ] b. on the finger pickup and air seeder than on the vacuum meter.
[ ] c. on the finger pickup and vacuum meter than on the air seeder.
[ ] d. on all three planters equally.

7. Among the three planters, the number of days required to achieve 50% emergence was:

[ ] a. similar between the air seeder and finger pickup but differed between these two planters and the vacuum meter.
[ ] b. similar between the vacuum meter and finger pickup but differed between these two planters and the air seeder.
[ ] c. similar between the air seeder and the vacuum meter but differed between these two planters and the finger pickup.
[ ] d. the same.

Over

8. The number of days required to achieve the 50% emergence for NT was approximately:
[ ] a. 1.5 days greater than for CT.
[ ] b. 1.5 days less than for CT.
[ ] c. 2.5 days greater than for CT.
[ ] d. 2.5 days less than for CT.

9. The results of the study suggest that grower attention to planter mechanisms and maintenance becomes more critical:
[ ] a. under NT or when operating speeds are increased.
[ ] b. under CT of when operating speeds are increased.
[ ] c. under NT or when operating speeds are decreased.
[ ] d. under CT or when operating speeds are decreased.

10. The planter that produced the lowest within-row plant spacing standard deviation and the most uniform emergence also achieved the:
[ ] a. lowest LAI.
[ ] b. lowest dry matter accumulation.
[ ] c. highest yield.
[ ] d. highest LAI, dry matter accumulation and yield.

DETACH HERE

SELF-STUDY EXAM REGISTRATION FORM

Name: ____________________

Address: ____________________

City: ____________ State/Province: ____________ Zip: ____________

CCA Certification #: ____________________

Credit Card #: ____________ Type of Card: Visa ❑ Mastercard ❑ Discovery ❑ Am Express ❑

Expiration Date ____________ Name on Card: ____________

Enclose a $10 check payable to American Society of Agronomy.

X ____________________

Signature of Registrant as it appears on Code of Ethics

I certify that I alone completed this self-study course and recognize that an ethics violation may revoke my CCA status.

This exam issued March 2005 expires March 2008.

SELF-STUDY EXAM EVALUATION FORM

Rating Scale: 1=Poor 5=Excellent

Information presented will be useful in my daily crop advising activities: 1 2 3 4 5

Information was organized and logical: 1 2 3 4 5

Graphics/tables were appropriate and enhanced my learning: 1 2 3 4 5

I was stimulated to think how to use and apply the information presented: 1 2 3 4 5

This article addressed the stated competency area and performance objective(s): 1 2 3 4 5

Briefly explain any “1” ratings: ____________________

Topics you would like to see addressed in future self-study materials: ____________________