



Herbicide Selection and Management Practices Associated with Minnesota's 2014 Corn Production

Minnesota Department of Agriculture
USDA, NASS, Minnesota Field Office

September 2016

**625 Robert Street North St. Paul, MN 55155-2538 651-201-6000 1-800-967-AGRI
www.mda.state.mn.us**

In accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, this information is available in alternative forms of communication upon request by calling 651-201-6000. TTY users can call the Minnesota Relay Service at 711. The MDA is an equal opportunity employer and provider.

For information regarding this report contact:
 Denton Bruening
 Minnesota Department of Agriculture
 Pesticide and Fertilizer Management Division
 651-201-6399

Contents

Contents	1
Abstract	3
Acknowledgements	4
2014 Herbicide Use Practices Summary and Highlights	4
Survey Design and Implementation	5
Introduction	6
Data Collection Process and History	6
Data Reporting and Limitations	8
Table 1. Summary of respondents and corresponding corn acres by county and PMAs.....	9
Statewide Herbicide Applications and Management on Corn	11
Table 2. Percentage of respondents that used corn herbicides.....	11
Table 3. “Did you: Apply herbicides yourself? Have herbicides custom applied? Both?” (Q.3)	12
Table 4. “Do you know the active ingredients of the herbicides you used in 2014?” (Q.4)	13
Table 5. “Do you keep herbicide application records on your farm?” (Q.5).....	14
Table 6. “Do you usually read the label for pesticide products applied on your farm?” (Q.6)	15
Table 7. “Was Atrazine applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.7)	16
Table 8. “Was Atrazine incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.10)	17
Table 9. “Did you make more than one application of Atrazine to the same corn field in 2014?” (Q.11).....	18
Table 10. “Was Acetochlor applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.12)	19
Table 11. “Was Acetochlor incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.15)	20
Table 12. “Did you make more than one application of Acetochlor to the same corn field in 2014?” (Q.16)	21
Herbicide Program Decisions	22
Table 13. “Who decides what products to apply?” (Q.17)	22
Table 14. “Who decides when to apply the herbicides?” (Q.18).....	23
Table 15. “Who scouts your fields?” (Q.19).....	24
Table 16. “Who determines if application setbacks or restrictions are appropriate on your farm?” (Q.20)	25
Scouting for Weeds and Related Practices	26
Table 17. “Has someone mapped weed infestations in any of your fields in the last three years?” (Q.21)	26

Table 18. “Do you choose herbicides based on type of weeds and/or density of weeds?” (Q.22)	27
Water Resources and Soil Resources.....	28
Table 19. “Do you know the soil texture of your farm?” (Q.23).....	28
Table 20. “Do you know the organic matter level of your farm soils?” (Q.24)	29
Table 21. “Do you know the depth to the water table in your field?” (Q.25).....	30
Table 22. “Is the water table at a depth greater than 30 feet?” (Q.26).....	31
Figure 1. Information sources used to determine water table depth (Q.26a).....	31
Table 23. “Are any streams, lakes, or other surface waters immediately adjacent to or in your corn fields?” (Q.27).....	32
Table 24. “Are there filter strips or vegetative buffers on any of these acres?” (Q.28)	33
Table 25. “Were they required as part of a conservation program?”(Q.28a)	34
Table 26. “Do you irrigate corn?” (Q.29).....	35
Table 27. “Do you have an irrigation water management plan?” (Q.29a)	35
Figure 2. “What type of tillage did you use before planting on the majority of your corn aces?” (Q.30)	36
General Practices for Herbicide Application	36
Table 28. “Do you use precision applications for herbicides (variable rate applications)?” (Q.31)	36
Table 29. “In general, do you alternate use of herbicide products to keep weeds from becoming resistant to herbicides?” (Q.32)	37
Table 30. “Did you reduce from previous applications, the rate per acre of any corn herbicide?” (Q.33)	38
Table 31. “Did you select an herbicide with a different mode of action to reduce weed resistance to herbicides?” (Q.34).....	39
Table 32. “Did you choose a particular herbicide to reduce impacts to surface water or groundwater?” (Q.35).....	40
Table 33. “Did you band herbicide applications to reduce use?” (Q.36)	41
Appendix 1. Survey Form.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Abstract

The Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA) is responsible for the development and promotion of herbicide Best Management Practices (BMPs) which optimize production and profitability while protecting the state's water resources. The MDA is also responsible for monitoring pesticide use and for promoting the adoption of associated BMPs. This survey was designed and conducted in partnership with the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) to specifically assess the status of BMP awareness and adoption in relation to the use of corn herbicides.

In Minnesota, the corn herbicide active ingredients atrazine and acetochlor (and their breakdown products) are detected frequently in groundwater and surface water resources. Atrazine has not exceeded the applicable drinking water standards in groundwater. However, in 2001 and 2005, acetochlor concentrations exceeded surface water quality standards to protect aquatic life in two southern Minnesota watersheds¹. The MDA has invested considerable staff time in water monitoring, development of BMP education programs, and BMP assessment. Atrazine and acetochlor are the main focus of this survey. Phone enumerators located at NASS contacted over 4,000 producers in early 2015. From this pool, approximately 2,100 farmers who raised corn during the 2014 growing season shared valuable information on herbicide selection and management.

The general purpose of this survey was to ask farmers about fundamental herbicide use practices such as record keeping, reading the label, scouting, responsibility for making decisions on product selection and timing, and knowledge about physical characteristics (soil texture, depth to groundwater, use of buffer strips, etc.). More specific questions related to atrazine and acetochlor included the use of split applications, reduced rates, and incorporation.

These types of surveys help MDA understand regulatory compliance, adoption of voluntary practices, need for additional information, and opportunities for future technical assistance.

Every other year, the MDA has partnered with NASS to produce a detailed report on pesticide use and rates used on the state's four major crops. Readers are encouraged to visit the most recent report, "2013 Pesticide Usage on Four Major Minnesota Crops" at <http://www.mda.state.mn.us/chemicals/pesticides/pesticideuse.aspx>

¹ "Monitoring & Assessment for Agricultural Chemicals in the Environment" found on MDA Website at: <http://www.mda.state.mn.us/monitoring>

Acknowledgements

This survey was a cooperative effort by the Minnesota Department of Agriculture (MDA), the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), and the NASS Field Offices in Minnesota. The detailed information about herbicide use practices could not have been collected without the cooperation of the thousands of farmers who voluntarily responded to the survey in the midst of their busy lives, and for this we are extremely grateful. Similarly, the assistance of agricultural chemical dealer and cooperatives is much appreciated. Special thanks go to Dan Lofthus, Director of the NASS Minnesota Field Office and his respective staff for assistance with survey design, data collection and processing. The MDA is ultimately responsible for the representations of data provided in this report and for the design of the survey mechanism used to collect that data. Excellent participation and good record keeping practices by Minnesota farmers and agricultural chemical dealerships played a vital part in providing complete and detailed herbicide information.

2014 Herbicide Use Practices Summary and Highlights

This report summarizes survey results for a number of important practices associated with herbicide use on Minnesota's 2014 corn acres. Over 2,100 producers participated in the telephone survey and herbicide information was collected for 542,570 corn acres, representing 7 percent of Minnesota's 8,200,000 corn acres. Survey questions focused on the 95 percent of the respondents that used herbicides for weed control. The survey targeted a variety of practices including herbicide selection and associated management practices (e.g., MDA's herbicide BMPs). This is the fifth herbicide survey performed by the MDA and NASS to collect information on herbicide management practices on Minnesota corn acres.

Survey Design and Implementation

Ten Pesticide Monitoring Areas (noted as “PMA” throughout the report), were previously developed by MDA staff. Counties were clustered based on similarities in geology, soils, and crops. These areas also define the general boundaries of the monitoring regions used by the MDA water resource monitoring program. More information about PMA designations can be found at

<http://www.mda.state.mn.us/chemicals/pesticides/~//media/Files/chemicals/2009gwmnetdesign.ashx> Regional pesticide use information is used to help design and implement specific water quality monitoring and pesticide educational programs.



NASS developed a sampling population of 7,000 farms by randomly drawing from its entire database of all corn growers in Minnesota. There were 2,103 farmers that raised corn in 2014 and that completed the survey. The definition of “corn” for purposes of this report includes both grain and silage and excludes sweet corn and popcorn. All growers were asked four basic questions regarding herbicide selection and management. The remaining questions were for those farmers who used atrazine or acetochlor.

Due to the low intensity of row crop agriculture in portions of northern Minnesota, survey results for PMA 2 and PMA 3 were not reported or included in this analysis.

Introduction

Data Collection Process and History

The MDA is required by state law to monitor pesticide use on a biennial basis. Minn. Stat. § 18B.064. In pursuit of fulfilling that responsibility, the MDA began exploring the possibility of using the existing framework of the NASS to enhance and broaden pesticide use monitoring efforts. NASS has a long history of providing statewide crop and production statistics. Over the last decade, NASS has also become an important information source for pesticide and fertilizer use. Several joint pilot projects evolved with the financial assistance from Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and were conducted from 2001-2003. These pilots were essential to the final methodology used in this report.

The first pilot² was conducted in 2001 by expanding the existing Agricultural Resource Management Study (ARMS) developed by NASS. The normal number of participating Minnesota corn farms in an ARMS survey is about 150. The pilot increased the number of personal interviews to approximately 600 and most of the enhancements were focused on the southern third of the state. The pilot provided reliable regionally-enhanced data on pesticide product choices and application rates. Additionally, useful information on primary sources of pesticide management information, scouting, timing, and other pesticide management related information was obtained.

A second pilot³ was developed with the goal of expanding to a statewide scale while reducing costs. In neighboring North Dakota, the USDA, NASS, the North Dakota Field Office, and North Dakota State University Extension had already established a strong tradition in collecting statewide pesticide use by using NASS telephone enumerators. MDA and NASS used many techniques from the North Dakota program, but decided to expand the level of detail by including pesticide application rates. Historically, most mail or telephone style surveys have been unsuccessful at quantifying pesticide rates. Due to the numerous formulations, different application rates and units of measure (i.e. Active Ingredient [a.i.] can be expressed in pounds, ounces, pints or quarts), complications can quickly develop. Another major complicating factor may result due to the farmer using the services of a commercial pesticide applicator. If the farmer did not apply the product, the likelihood that the farmer would be familiar with the product and corresponding rate decreases significantly.

² “Expanded Minnesota Agricultural Statistics Pesticide Use Data”, 2003, by NASS and MDA.

³ Unpublished data. From the September 20, 2003 EPA Report.

The second pilot survey was conducted in 2003 to test two methods of collecting pesticide rate information. “Method One” was conducted in Douglas County with 150 randomly selected farm operators. Operators were interviewed over the phone by the NASS enumerators. If the operator did not know the pesticides and/or rates, no additional follow-up work was conducted and the data was limited to information that was provided. “Method Two” was used in neighboring Grant County, where another 150 farm operators were contacted, and when farm records were incomplete, follow-up calls were made to the pesticide dealer to complete the survey. The number of surveys with complete data sets significantly increased with the additional assistance from the dealerships. Eighty-three percent of the surveys were complete in Grant County, where dealer follow-up calls were made, compared to forty-six percent in Douglas County. Equally impressive was the overall support by the local dealerships.

Subsequently, statewide surveys are conducted using “Method Two” from the pilot project conducted in Douglas and Grant Counties.

Farmers are interviewed over the phone in February. These are “cold calls,” meaning that the farmers did not get any type of notification about the survey prior to the contact. Consequently, all information collected using this approach is based upon either the participant’s memory or information readily available during the interview. The interviews typically last from five to ten minutes.

Survey questions can be found in Appendix 1. Corresponding question numbers (noted as “Q” followed by the survey question number) are incorporated throughout the report and also in the table captions. The reader is encouraged to reference the survey to help interpret the results.

Questions are grouped into four categories including:

1. **General information.** Who applied the product, label and active ingredients, and record-keeping;
2. **Scouting for weeds and related practices.** Scouting, mapping, weed type, density, and herbicide resistant corn varieties;
3. **Water resources.** Physical distances from groundwater, surface water and buffers, and irrigation management plans; and
4. **General practices.** Herbicide rotations and dealer involvement in herbicide management.

After obtaining some very general NASS information, participants were then asked if they grew corn during the 2014 cropping season (Q.1). The interview process ended if they had not produced field or silage corn. Participants were then asked to identify the number of corn acres planted (Q.2). Table 1 includes the number of respondents and associated corn acres by county and Pesticide Monitoring Area. Also, included in Table 1 is the NASS total corn acres for Minnesota (2014) and the percentage of acres surveyed.

Data Reporting and Limitations

The primary purpose of this survey was to obtain an understanding of basic herbicide management practices associated with corn production. Participants were asked to identify the herbicides used in very generic terms. Some knowledge of the herbicides used (i.e. soil applied, post-emergent, etc.) is essential to understand the current management strategies associated with them. It is important to note that the MDA and its partners provide a highly detailed herbicide use and application rate report on a biennial basis⁴.

Due to the simplified method used to collect what is typically considered complex data, it is imperative that the reader understand the limitations of the data sets. Many surveys conducted by NASS employ advanced sampling strategies which are designed to statistically represent a non-homogenous population, thus “weighting” the data to account for sample size, county size, and crop acreage, etc. Such strategies can be very expensive and are not without their own limitations.⁵ This survey did not employ such strategies; rather, corn farmers were randomly selected from across Minnesota. Therefore, weighting across areas or counties was not performed. The MDA can be contacted to further discuss interpretation of the survey data.

⁴ “2013 Pesticide Usage on Four Major Minnesota Crops” found on the MDA website at: <http://www.mda.state.mn.us/chemicals/pesticides/pesticideuse.aspx>

⁵ For an explanation of survey methods and data quality associated with annual county-level data, visit the NASS “Quick Stats” Frequently Asked Questions website at: <http://www.nass.usda.gov/QuickStats/Screens/faqs.htm>

Table 1. Summary of respondents and corresponding corn acres by county and PMAs.

County	Pesticide Monitoring Area (PMA)	Number of Respondents	2014 Planted Corn Acres [§]	Surveyed Corn Acres	Percentage of Acres Surveyed
Clay	1	19	110,000	9,174	8
Grant	1	9	115,500	3,932	3
Kittson	1	**	**	**	**
Mahnomen	1	**	**	**	**
Marshall	1	6	28,300	1,091	4
Norman	1	10	77,200	4,808	6
Pennington	1	**	**	**	**
Polk	1	13	69,200	3,133	5
Red Lake	1	**	**	**	**
Roseau	1	**	**	**	**
Traverse	1	14	133,000	6,904	5
Wilkin	1	15	95,500	6,616	7
Totals	1	107	665,500	38,142	6
Becker	4	11	54,800	2,736	5
Benton	4	25	70,100	2,186	3
Cass	4	**	**	**	**
Crow Wing	4	**	**	**	**
Douglas	4	34	57,500	6,147	11
Hubbard	4	**	**	**	**
Kandiyohi	4	28	163,000	10,145	6
Morrison	4	76	97,500	9,413	10
Otter Tail	4	71	164,000	9,605	6
Pope	4	29	111,000	9,509	9
Sherburne	4	8	21,800	2,998	14
Stearns	4	114	208,000	18,022	9
Todd	4	49	66,100	4,785	7
Wadena	4	13	22,100	739	3
Totals	4	473	1,035,900	77,859	8
Chisago	5	12	22,300	984	4
Isanti	5	14	25,400	3,039	12
Kanabec	5	11	10,300	830	8
Mille Lacs	5	11	14,600	1,257	9
Pine	5	18	14,500	1,892	13
Totals	5	66	87,100	8,002	9
Big Stone	6	11	102,000	3,775	4
Chippewa	6	28	150,500	10,161	7
Lac qui Parle	6	28	180,000	9,099	5
Stevens	6	26	149,000	11,176	8
Swift	6	25	198,000	11,505	6
Yellow Medicine	6	30	199,000	14,155	7
Totals	6	148	978,500	59,871	6

County	Pesticide Monitoring Area (PMA)	Number of Respondents	2014 Planted Corn Acres [§]	Surveyed Corn Acres	Percentage of Acres Surveyed
Lincoln	7	19	123,000	5,804	5
Lyon	7	29	190,500	7,486	4
Murray	7	35	187,000	11,649	6
Nobles	7	52	221,000	13,397	6
Pipestone	7	24	117,000	7,526	6
Rock	7	23	148,500	6,480	4
Totals	7	182	987,000	52,342	5
Blue Earth	8	46	194,000	16,662	9
Brown	8	51	169,500	11,555	7
Cottonwood	8	34	180,000	11,272	6
Faribault	8	32	222,000	13,185	6
Freeborn	8	47	213,500	15,081	7
Jackson	8	45	191,500	17,264	9
Le Sueur	8	27	102,000	4,356	4
Martin	8	34	235,500	12,387	5
McLeod	8	32	91,600	8,089	9
Meeker	8	30	116,000	9,045	8
Nicollet	8	33	123,500	12,494	10
Redwood	8	61	245,500	18,011	7
Renville	8	46	275,500	18,675	7
Rice	8	33	92,000	8,123	9
Sibley	8	39	152,000	8,625	6
Steele	8	28	129,000	11,283	9
Waseca	8	28	121,000	8,519	7
Watonwan	8	26	140,000	9,508	7
Wright	8	32	63,600	4,388	7
Totals	8	704	3,057,700	218,522	7
Dodge	9	20	141,000	5,436	4
Fillmore	9	54	194,000	12,902	7
Goodhue	9	62	161,000	14,531	9
Houston	9	33	61,100	3,762	6
Mower	9	30	225,500	11,560	5
Olmsted	9	40	133,000	7,798	6
Wabasha	9	42	99,700	8,022	8
Winona	9	54	85,500	7,875	9
Totals	9	335	1,100,800	71,886	7
Anoka	10	**	**	**	**
Carver	10	26	47,800	2,461	5
Dakota	10	23	94,200	6,857	7
Hennepin	10	**	**	**	**
Scott	10	18	34,900	3,228	9
Washington	10	12	21,400	2,104	10
Totals	10	88	215,200	15,361	7
State	All	2,103	8,127,700	542,570	7

[§] Note: USDA/NASS Minnesota Corn Acreage Planted

** Not reported by NASS

Statewide Herbicide Applications and Management on Corn

Ninety five percent (95%) of the respondents reported using herbicides and those respondents managed 98% of the corn acres reported in this survey (Table 2). As previously stated, if herbicides were not used, the respondent's survey was then concluded.

Tables 3 through 33 contain information from all corn producers that used herbicides. Because, not all farmers answered every question, the sum of total acres and the sum of total respondents are sometimes less than the statewide averages.

Participants were then asked who made the application (Q. 3). Forty-one percent (41%) of the respondents reported self-applied, 47% of the respondents reported custom applied and 12% of the respondents reported both self-applied and custom applied. Table 3 summarizes who applied the application and the responses are grouped by PMAs.

Farmers who applied their own herbicides averaged 340 acres of corn while farmers who had pesticides custom applied averaged 165 acres of corn. Farmers who both self-applied and custom applied herbicides raised an average of 421 acres of corn.

Table 2. Percentage of respondents that used corn herbicides.

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Do You Use Herbicides?	Percent of All Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	92
1 – Northwest Red River	No	8
4 – Central Sands	Yes	93
4 – Central Sands	No	7
5 – East Central	Yes	86
5 – East Central	No	14
6 – West Central	Yes	97
6 – West Central	No	3
7 – Southwest	Yes	98
7 – Southwest	No	2
8 – South Central	Yes	97
8 – South Central	No	3
9 – Southeast	Yes	93
9 – Southeast	No	7
10 – Metro	Yes	93
10 – Metro	No	7
Statewide	Yes	95
Statewide	No	5

Table 3. “Did you: Apply herbicides yourself? Have herbicides custom applied? Both?” (Q.3)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Application Type	Percent of Respondents	Average Corn Acres per Respondent
1 – Northwest Red River	Self-Applied	60	403
1 – Northwest Red River	Custom Applied	27	218
1 – Northwest Red River	Both	13	610
4 – Central Sands	Self-Applied	43	238
4 – Central Sands	Custom Applied	52	119
4 – Central Sands	Both	5	164
5 – East Central	Self-Applied	47	168
5 – East Central	Custom Applied	53	106
5 – East Central	Both	0	0
6 – West Central	Self-Applied	38	538
6 – West Central	Custom Applied	44	236
6 – West Central	Both	18	548
7 – Southwest	Self-Applied	48	335
7 – Southwest	Custom Applied	37	199
7 – Southwest	Both	15	375
8 – South Central	Self-Applied	40	418
8 – South Central	Custom Applied	44	174
8 – South Central	Both	16	459
9 – Southeast	Self-Applied	30	274
9 – Southeast	Custom Applied	62	181
9 – Southeast	Both	8	387
10 – Metro	Self-Applied	44	209
10 – Metro	Custom Applied	44	134
10 – Metro	Both	12	248
Statewide	Self-Applied	41	340
Statewide	Custom Applied	47	165
Statewide	Both	12	421

Farmers were asked, “Do you know the active ingredients (a.i.) of the herbicides you used in 2014?” (Q.4). Based upon previous surveys, most farmers identified the product name (i.e. “Roundup”, etc.), but identifying the AI (i.e. glyphosate) was considerably more challenging. Of all statewide respondents (self-applicators and those that hired a custom applicator), 46% stated they knew the a.i. in their herbicide applications and 9% stated they knew some of the a.i. (Table 4). Fifty-seven percent of the farmers that applied the products themselves⁶ were able to identify

⁶ Farmers that applied pesticides themselves, referred to as “self-applicators,” includes farmers that self-apply and farmers that self-apply and custom apply (both), but not farmers who only had herbicides custom applied.

the a.i. It must be emphasized that farmers were asked these questions “on the spot” and were not given the opportunity to check their records during the telephone interview.

Table 4. “Do you know the active ingredients of the herbicides you used in 2014?” (Q.4)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Knew the Active Ingredients	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of “Self-Applicators”
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	69	75
1 – Northwest Red River	No	23	17
1 – Northwest Red River	Some	8	8
4 – Central Sands	Yes	47	57
4 – Central Sands	No	45	36
4 – Central Sands	Some	8	7
5 – East Central	Yes	60	78
5 – East Central	No	33	19
5 – East Central	Some	7	3
6 – West Central	Yes	43	50
6 – West Central	No	49	37
6 – West Central	Some	8	13
7 – Southwest	Yes	43	54
7 – Southwest	No	45	37
7 – Southwest	Some	12	9
8 – South Central	Yes	44	54
8 – South Central	No	45	35
8 – South Central	Some	11	11
9 – Southeast	Yes	42	59
9 – Southeast	No	48	34
9 – Southeast	Some	10	7
10 – Metro	Yes	44	50
10 – Metro	No	50	44
10 – Metro	Some	6	6
Statewide	Yes	46	57
Statewide	No	45	34
Statewide	Some	9	9

Producers were asked if they kept pesticide application records on the farm (Q.5). Sixty-eight percent of all statewide respondents kept all their herbicide records on the farm and 3% kept some records on the farm (Table 5). Eighty-four percent of the farmers that applied their own herbicides kept records on the farm.

Table 5. “Do you keep herbicide application records on your farm?” (Q.5)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Kept “On Farm” Pesticide Records	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of Self-Applicators
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	79	85
1 – Northwest Red River	No	17	12
1 – Northwest Red River	Some	4	3
4 – Central Sands	Yes	60	74
4 – Central Sands	No	37	24
4 – Central Sands	Some	3	2
5 – East Central	Yes	61	78
5 – East Central	No	35	22
5 – East Central	Some	4	0
6 – West Central	Yes	73	83
6 – West Central	No	25	13
6 – West Central	Some	2	4
7 – Southwest	Yes	76	91
7 – Southwest	No	22	8
7 – Southwest	Some	2	1
8 – South Central	Yes	74	90
8 – South Central	No	23	8
8 – South Central	Some	3	2
9 – Southeast	Yes	59	84
9 – Southeast	No	39	13
9 – Southeast	Some	2	3
10 – Metro	Yes	62	73
10 – Metro	No	34	19
10 – Metro	Some	4	8
Statewide	Yes	68	84
Statewide	No	29	14
Statewide	Some	3	2

Participants were asked about the practice of reading the label (Q.6) and the results are provided in Table 6. Eighty-seven percent of all statewide respondents who applied herbicide themselves usually read the label. This percentage drops to 64% for all farmers.

Table 6. “Do you usually read the label for pesticide products applied on your farm?” (Q.6)

Pesticide Management Area	Response to “Reading the Label”	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of Self-Applicators
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	79	86
1 – Northwest Red River	No	21	14
4 – Central Sands	Yes	57	85
4 – Central Sands	No	43	15
5 – East Central	Yes	60	89
5 – East Central	No	40	11
6 – West Central	Yes	66	91
6 – West Central	No	34	9
7 – Southwest	Yes	74	88
7 – Southwest	No	26	12
8 – South Central	Yes	66	88
8 – South Central	No	34	12
9 – Southeast	Yes	58	88
9 – Southeast	No	42	12
10 – Metro	Yes	62	75
10 – Metro	No	38	25
Statewide	Yes	64	87
Statewide	No	36	13

Participants were asked if they applied atrazine to their corn acres. A “Yes” response means they did use atrazine on at least **some** of their corn acres. A “No” response means they did not use atrazine on any of their corn acres. Table 7 details the responses to the question of whether atrazine was used and the percentage of farmers who knew if they applied atrazine (answered yes or no). Statewide, thirteen percent of the respondents applied atrazine on some of their acres.

Table 7. “Was Atrazine applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.7)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Atrazine Applied	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of Respondents who Knew[§]
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	10	11
1 – Northwest Red River	No	86	89
1 – Northwest Red River	Don't Know	4	
4 – Central Sands	Yes	9	9
4 – Central Sands	No	82	91
4 – Central Sands	Don't Know	9	
5 – East Central	Yes	25	29
5 – East Central	No	61	71
5 – East Central	Don't Know	14	
6 – West Central	Yes	8	9
6 – West Central	No	87	91
6 – West Central	Don't Know	5	
7 – Southwest	Yes	15	16
7 – Southwest	No	78	84
7 – Southwest	Don't Know	7	
8 – South Central	Yes	15	16
8 – South Central	No	76	84
8 – South Central	Don't Know	9	
9 – Southeast	Yes	23	26
9 – Southeast	No	66	74
9 – Southeast	Don't Know	11	
10 – Metro	Yes	15	16
10 – Metro	No	75	84
10 – Metro	Don't Know	10	
Statewide	Yes	13	16
Statewide	No	78	84
Statewide	Don't Know	9	

[§] Percent was calculated using only those respondents who answered yes or no to the question.

Nine percent (173 farmers) of the producers were not aware whether their herbicide package included atrazine (as an AI). Of this subgroup, 34% (or 59 farmers) knew the product(s) in their package. Of the farmers that knew the product name(s), it was determined that 22% (or 13 farmers) did apply a product within their herbicide package that contained atrazine.

Tables 8-9 pertain to the farmers applying atrazine. Included are those farmers who answered, “Yes”, to the question: “Was atrazine applied on any of your corn acres?” Farmers who answered, “I don’t know”, were included if they were later determined to have applied atrazine through identification of the product name. These farmers were classified through Q.7, Q.8, and Q.9.

Table 8. “Was Atrazine incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.10)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Was Atrazine Incorporated	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	50
1 – Northwest Red River	No	50
4 – Central Sands	Yes	38
4 – Central Sands	No	62
5 – East Central	Yes	31
5 – East Central	No	69
6 – West Central	Yes	27
6 – West Central	No	73
7 – Southwest	Yes	22
7 – Southwest	No	78
8 – South Central	Yes	34
8 – South Central	No	66
9 – Southeast	Yes	28
9 – Southeast	No	72
10 – Metro	Yes	33
10 – Metro	No	67
Statewide	Yes	32
Statewide	No	68

Table 9. “Did you make more than one application of Atrazine to the same corn field in 2014?”⁷ (Q.11)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Was Atrazine Applied More Than Once	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	0
1 – Northwest Red River	No	100
4 – Central Sands	Yes	0
4 – Central Sands	No	100
5 – East Central	Yes	0
5 – East Central	No	100
6 – West Central	Yes	0
6 – West Central	No	100
7 – Southwest	Yes	0
7 – Southwest	No	100
8 – South Central	Yes	5
8 – South Central	No	95
9 – Southeast	Yes	3
9 – Southeast	No	97
10 – Metro	Yes	0
10 – Metro	No	100
Statewide	Yes	2
Statewide	No	98

⁷ In previous surveys this question was worded as “Did you make a split application of Atrazine on this field?” Because farmers were answering the question as yes when there was more than one application, but more than one application did not include Atrazine the question was changed to the current status. As a result very few farmers apply more than one application of Atrazine to a field as opposed to the former question of split applying Atrazine.

Participants were asked if they applied acetochlor to their corn acres. A “Yes” response means they did use acetochlor on at least some of their corn acres. A “No” response means they did not use acetochlor on any of their corn acres. Table 10 details the responses to the question of whether acetochlor was used and the percentage of farmers who knew if they applied acetochlor (answered yes or no). Statewide, nine percent of the respondents applied acetochlor on some of their acres.

Table 10. “Was Acetochlor applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.12)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Acetochlor Applied	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of Respondents who Knew[§]
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	6	7
1 – Northwest Red River	No	84	93
1 – Northwest Red River	Don’t Know	10	
4 – Central Sands	Yes	5	7
4 – Central Sands	No	71	93
4 – Central Sands	Don’t Know	24	
5 – East Central	Yes	2	2
5 – East Central	No	70	98
5 – East Central	Don’t Know	28	
6 – West Central	Yes	9	12
6 – West Central	No	70	88
6 – West Central	Don’t Know	21	
7 – Southwest	Yes	15	19
7 – Southwest	No	64	81
7 – Southwest	Don’t Know	21	
8 – South Central	Yes	11	14
8 – South Central	No	63	86
8 – South Central	Don’t Know	26	
9 – Southeast	Yes	13	18
9 – Southeast	No	57	82
9 – Southeast	Don’t Know	30	
10 – Metro	Yes	4	5
10 – Metro	No	74	95
10 – Metro	Don’t Know	22	
Statewide	Yes	9	12
Statewide	No	66	88
Statewide	Don’t Know	25	

[§] Percent was calculated using only those respondents who answered yes or no to the question.

Twenty five percent (495 farmers) of the producers were not aware whether their herbicide package included acetochlor (as an AI). Of this subgroup, 56% (or 278 farmers) knew the product(s) in their package. Of the farmers that knew the product name(s), it was determined that 60% (or 165 farmers) did apply a product within their herbicide package that contained acetochlor.

Tables 11-12 pertain to the farmers applying acetochlor. Included are those farmers who answered, “Yes”, to the question: “Was acetochlor applied on any of your corn acres?” Farmers who answered, “I don’t know”, were included if they were later determined to have applied atrazine through identification of the product name. These farmers were classified through Q.12, Q.13, and Q.14.

Table 11. “Was Acetochlor incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?” (Q.15)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Was Acetochlor Incorporated	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	67
1 – Northwest Red River	No	33
4 – Central Sands	Yes	30
4 – Central Sands	No	70
5 – East Central	Yes	33
5 – East Central	No	67
6 – West Central	Yes	52
6 – West Central	No	48
7 – Southwest	Yes	48
7 – Southwest	No	52
8 – South Central	Yes	57
8 – South Central	No	43
9 – Southeast	Yes	43
9 – Southeast	No	57
10 – Metro	Yes	75
10 – Metro	No	25
Statewide	Yes	49
Statewide	No	51

Table 12. “Did you make more than one application of Acetochlor to the same corn field in 2014?”⁸ (Q.16)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Was Acetochlor Applied More Than Once	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	0
1 – Northwest Red River	No	100
4 – Central Sands	Yes	6
4 – Central Sands	No	94
5 – East Central	Yes	0
5 – East Central	No	100
6 – West Central	Yes	7
6 – West Central	No	93
7 – Southwest	Yes	2
7 – Southwest	No	98
8 – South Central	Yes	4
8 – South Central	No	96
9 – Southeast	Yes	9
9 – Southeast	No	91
10 – Metro	Yes	20
10 – Metro	No	80
Statewide	Yes	5
Statewide	No	95

⁸ In previous surveys this question was worded as “Did you make a split application of Acetochlor on this field?” Because farmers were answering the question as yes when there was more than one application, but more than one application did not include Acetochlor the question was changed to the current status. As a result very few farmers apply more than one application of Acetochlor to a field as opposed to the former question of split applying Acetochlor.

Herbicide Program Decisions

Questions 17-20 were related to herbicide decisions. Only farmers who applied atrazine or acetochlor answered these questions. Of the 2,103 farmers surveyed, 560 (27%) applied either atrazine or acetochlor. The following questions were answered by those 560 farmers who applied atrazine or acetochlor. Not all 560 farmers chose to answer each question.

Table 13. “Who decides what products to apply?” (Q.17)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Who Decides What Product to Apply	Percent of All Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Farmer	50
1 – Northwest Red River	Dealer/Consultant	17
1 – Northwest Red River	Both	33
4 – Central Sands	Farmer	30
4 – Central Sands	Dealer/Consultant	30
4 – Central Sands	Both	40
5 – East Central	Farmer	44
5 – East Central	Dealer/Consultant	17
5 – East Central	Both	39
6 – West Central	Farmer	29
6 – West Central	Dealer/Consultant	16
6 – West Central	Both	55
7 – Southwest	Farmer	35
7 – Southwest	Dealer/Consultant	13
7 – Southwest	Both	52
8 – South Central	Farmer	32
8 – South Central	Dealer/Consultant	13
8 – South Central	Both	55
9 – Southeast	Farmer	21
9 – Southeast	Dealer/Consultant	27
9 – Southeast	Both	52
10 – Metro	Farmer	13
10 – Metro	Dealer/Consultant	50
10 – Metro	Both	37
Statewide	Farmer	30
Statewide	Dealer/Consultant	20
Statewide	Both	50

Table 14. “Who decides when to apply the herbicides?” (Q.18)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Who Decides When to Apply Herbicides	Percent of All Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Farmer	61
1 – Northwest Red River	Dealer/Consultant	11
1 – Northwest Red River	Both	28
4 – Central Sands	Farmer	42
4 – Central Sands	Dealer/Consultant	31
4 – Central Sands	Both	27
5 – East Central	Farmer	67
5 – East Central	Dealer/Consultant	11
5 – East Central	Both	22
6 – West Central	Farmer	42
6 – West Central	Dealer/Consultant	26
6 – West Central	Both	32
7 – Southwest	Farmer	58
7 – Southwest	Dealer/Consultant	7
7 – Southwest	Both	35
8 – South Central	Farmer	54
8 – South Central	Dealer/Consultant	10
8 – South Central	Both	36
9 – Southeast	Farmer	45
9 – Southeast	Dealer/Consultant	20
9 – Southeast	Both	35
10 – Metro	Farmer	38
10 – Metro	Dealer/Consultant	37
10 – Metro	Both	25
Statewide	Farmer	51
Statewide	Dealer/Consultant	16
Statewide	Both	33

Table 15. “Who scouts your fields?” (Q.19)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Who Scouts Your Fields	Percent of All Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Farmer	56
1 – Northwest Red River	Dealer/Consultant	17
1 – Northwest Red River	Both	22
1 – Northwest Red River	Field Not Scouted	5
4 – Central Sands	Farmer	48
4 – Central Sands	Dealer/Consultant	35
4 – Central Sands	Both	15
4 – Central Sands	Field Not Scouted	2
5 – East Central	Farmer	56
5 – East Central	Dealer/Consultant	11
5 – East Central	Both	33
5 – East Central	Field Not Scouted	0
6 – West Central	Farmer	45
6 – West Central	Dealer/Consultant	34
6 – West Central	Both	21
6 – West Central	Field Not Scouted	0
7 – Southwest	Farmer	54
7 – Southwest	Dealer/Consultant	16
7 – Southwest	Both	29
7 – Southwest	Field Not Scouted	1
8 – South Central	Farmer	49
8 – South Central	Dealer/Consultant	19
8 – South Central	Both	32
8 – South Central	Field Not Scouted	0
9 – Southeast	Farmer	50
9 – Southeast	Dealer/Consultant	19
9 – Southeast	Both	31
9 – Southeast	Field Not Scouted	0
10 – Metro	Farmer	56
10 – Metro	Dealer/Consultant	19
10 – Metro	Both	25
10 – Metro	Field Not Scouted	0
Statewide	Farmer	50
Statewide	Dealer/Consultant	22
Statewide	Both	27
Statewide	Field Not Scouted	1

Table 16. “Who determines if application setbacks or restrictions are appropriate on your farm?” (Q.20)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Who Determines Setbacks	Percent of All Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Farmer	50
1 – Northwest Red River	Dealer/Consultant	28
1 – Northwest Red River	Both	22
1 – Northwest Red River	Neither	0
4 – Central Sands	Farmer	41
4 – Central Sands	Dealer/Consultant	38
4 – Central Sands	Both	20
4 – Central Sands	Neither	1
5 – East Central	Farmer	56
5 – East Central	Dealer/Consultant	22
5 – East Central	Both	17
5 – East Central	Neither	5
6 – West Central	Farmer	34
6 – West Central	Dealer/Consultant	37
6 – West Central	Both	26
6 – West Central	Neither	3
7 – Southwest	Farmer	49
7 – Southwest	Dealer/Consultant	23
7 – Southwest	Both	27
7 – Southwest	Neither	1
8 – South Central	Farmer	48
8 – South Central	Dealer/Consultant	24
8 – South Central	Both	27
8 – South Central	Neither	1
9 – Southeast	Farmer	40
9 – Southeast	Dealer/Consultant	34
9 – Southeast	Both	22
9 – Southeast	Neither	4
10 – Metro	Farmer	38
10 – Metro	Dealer/Consultant	31
10 – Metro	Both	31
10 – Metro	Neither	0
Statewide	Farmer	45
Statewide	Dealer/Consultant	28
Statewide	Both	25
Statewide	Neither	2

Scouting for Weeds and Related Practices

Table 17. “Has someone mapped weed infestations in any of your fields in the last three years?” (Q.21)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Weed Infestations Mapped Last 3 Years	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	17
1 – Northwest Red River	No	83
4 – Central Sands	Yes	26
4 – Central Sands	No	74
5 – East Central	Yes	6
5 – East Central	No	94
6 – West Central	Yes	26
6 – West Central	No	74
7 – Southwest	Yes	28
7 – Southwest	No	72
8 – South Central	Yes	19
8 – South Central	No	81
9 – Southeast	Yes	17
9 – Southeast	No	83
10 – Metro	Yes	13
10 – Metro	No	87
Statewide	Yes	21
Statewide	No	79

Table 18. “Do you choose herbicides based on type of weeds and/or density of weeds?” (Q.22)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Herbicide Choice Based on Weeds	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	89
1 – Northwest Red River	No	11
4 – Central Sands	Yes	86
4 – Central Sands	No	14
5 – East Central	Yes	89
5 – East Central	No	11
6 – West Central	Yes	95
6 – West Central	No	5
7 – Southwest	Yes	97
7 – Southwest	No	3
8 – South Central	Yes	97
8 – South Central	No	3
9 – Southeast	Yes	90
9 – Southeast	No	10
10 – Metro	Yes	81
10 – Metro	No	19
Statewide	Yes	93
Statewide	No	7

Water Resources and Soil Resources

Table 19. “Do you know the soil texture of your farm?” (Q.23)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Soil Texture Known of Farm Soils	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	89
1 – Northwest Red River	No	11
4 – Central Sands	Yes	86
4 – Central Sands	No	14
5 – East Central	Yes	100
5 – East Central	No	0
6 – West Central	Yes	87
6 – West Central	No	13
7 – Southwest	Yes	81
7 – Southwest	No	19
8 – South Central	Yes	83
8 – South Central	No	17
9 – Southeast	Yes	90
9 – Southeast	No	10
10 – Metro	Yes	88
10 – Metro	No	12
Statewide	Yes	86
Statewide	No	14

Table 20. “Do you know the organic matter level of your farm soils?” (Q.24)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Organic Matter Known of Farm Soils	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	89
1 – Northwest Red River	No	11
4 – Central Sands	Yes	66
4 – Central Sands	No	34
5 – East Central	Yes	72
5 – East Central	No	28
6 – West Central	Yes	74
6 – West Central	No	26
7 – Southwest	Yes	78
7 – Southwest	No	22
8 – South Central	Yes	76
8 – South Central	No	24
9 – Southeast	Yes	70
9 – Southeast	No	30
10 – Metro	Yes	75
10 – Metro	No	25
Statewide	Yes	74
Statewide	No	26

Table 21. “Do you know the depth to the water table in your field?” (Q.25)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Knowledge of Depth to the Water Table	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	44
1 – Northwest Red River	No	56
4 – Central Sands	Yes	48
4 – Central Sands	No	52
5 – East Central	Yes	56
5 – East Central	No	44
6 – West Central	Yes	39
6 – West Central	No	61
7 – Southwest	Yes	33
7 – Southwest	No	67
8 – South Central	Yes	37
8 – South Central	No	63
9 – Southeast	Yes	33
9 – Southeast	No	67
10 – Metro	Yes	56
10 – Metro	No	44
Statewide	Yes	39
Statewide	No	61

Editor’s Note: Respondents that answered, “No” were then asked whether they believed that the depth to groundwater exceeded 30 feet. Table 22 details those responses.

Table 22. “Is the water table at a depth greater than 30 feet?” (Q.26)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	“Yes” Response Percent of Respondents	“No” Response Percent of Respondents	Don’t Know Response Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	56	11	33
4 – Central Sands	49	28	23
5 – East Central	33	17	50
6 – West Central	39	24	37
7 – Southwest	47	30	23
8 – South Central	40	26	34
9 – Southeast	61	15	24
10 – Metro	50	31	19
Statewide	46	24	30

Editor’s Note: Respondents who answered, “Yes”, to question 26 were then asked, “How was the depth primarily determined?” Figure 1 details their responses.

Figure 1. Information sources used to determine water table depth (Q.26a)




Table 23. “Are any streams, lakes, or other surface waters immediately adjacent to or in your corn fields?” (Q.27)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Surface Water Adjacent to or in Field	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	44
1 – Northwest Red River	No	56
4 – Central Sands	Yes	31
4 – Central Sands	No	69
5 – East Central	Yes	28
5 – East Central	No	72
6 – West Central	Yes	50
6 – West Central	No	50
7 – Southwest	Yes	35
7 – Southwest	No	65
8 – South Central	Yes	49
8 – South Central	No	51
9 – Southeast	Yes	24
9 – Southeast	No	76
10 – Metro	Yes	25
10 – Metro	No	75
Statewide	Yes	38
Statewide	No	62

Editor’s Note: Respondents who answered, “Yes” to question 27 were then asked, “Are there filter strips or vegetative buffers on any of these acres?” Table 24 details their responses.

Table 24. “Are there filter strips or vegetative buffers on any of these acres?” (Q.28)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Filter Strips or Buffers	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	100
1 – Northwest Red River	No	0
4 – Central Sands	Yes	91
4 – Central Sands	No	9
5 – East Central	Yes	80
5 – East Central	No	20
6 – West Central	Yes	89
6 – West Central	No	11
7 – Southwest	Yes	83
7 – Southwest	No	17
8 – South Central	Yes	88
8 – South Central	No	12
9 – Southeast	Yes	96
9 – Southeast	No	4
10 – Metro	Yes	100
10 – Metro	No	0
Statewide	Yes	90
Statewide	No	10

Editor’s Note: Respondents who answered “Yes” to question 28a in regards to having filter strips or vegetative buffers were then asked, “Were they required as part of a conservation program?” Table 25 details their responses.

Table 25. “Were they required as part of a conservation program?”(Q.28a)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Response	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	25
1 – Northwest Red River	No	75
4 – Central Sands	Yes	27
4 – Central Sands	No	73
5 – East Central	Yes	25
5 – East Central	No	75
6 – West Central	Yes	18
6 – West Central	No	82
7 – Southwest	Yes	50
7 – Southwest	No	50
8 – South Central	Yes	33
8 – South Central	No	67
9 – Southeast	Yes	38
9 – Southeast	No	62
10 – Metro	Yes	0
10 – Metro	No	100
Statewide	Yes	32
Statewide	No	68

Table 26. “Do you irrigate corn?” (Q.29)


Pesticide Monitoring Area	Irrigation	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	6
1 – Northwest Red River	No	94
4 – Central Sands	Yes	20
4 – Central Sands	No	80
5 – East Central	Yes	0
5 – East Central	No	100
6 – West Central	Yes	11
6 – West Central	No	89
7 – Southwest	Yes	0
7 – Southwest	No	100
8 – South Central	Yes	3
8 – South Central	No	97
9 – Southeast	Yes	3
9 – Southeast	No	97
10 – Metro	Yes	31
10 – Metro	No	69
Statewide	Yes	6
Statewide	No	94

Table 27. “Do you have an irrigation water management plan?” (Q.29a)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Irrigation Water Management Plan	Percent of Respondents
Statewide	Yes	80
Statewide	No	20

Editor’s Note. Only six percent (or 35) of the farmers used irrigation on corn acres; due to the small numbers of farmers irrigating, only statewide data is reported. This is 6% of farmers using atrazine or acetochlor.

Figure 2. “What type of tillage did you use before planting on the majority of your corn acres?” (Q.30)



General Practices for Herbicide Application

Table 28. “Do you use precision applications for herbicides (variable rate applications)?” (Q.31)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Variable Rate Applications	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	56
1 – Northwest Red River	No	44
4 – Central Sands	Yes	35
4 – Central Sands	No	65
5 – East Central	Yes	50
5 – East Central	No	50
6 – West Central	Yes	37
6 – West Central	No	63
7 – Southwest	Yes	49
7 – Southwest	No	51
8 – South Central	Yes	43
8 – South Central	No	57
9 – Southeast	Yes	42
9 – Southeast	No	58
10 – Metro	Yes	50
10 – Metro	No	50
Statewide	Yes	43
Statewide	No	57

Table 29. “In general, do you alternate use of herbicide products to keep weeds from becoming resistant to herbicides?” (Q.32)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Response to Using Alternative Herbicide	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	89
1 – Northwest Red River	No	11
4 – Central Sands	Yes	90
4 – Central Sands	No	10
5 – East Central	Yes	89
5 – East Central	No	11
6 – West Central	Yes	95
6 – West Central	No	5
7 – Southwest	Yes	87
7 – Southwest	No	13
8 – South Central	Yes	94
8 – South Central	No	6
9 – Southeast	Yes	88
9 – Southeast	No	12
10 – Metro	Yes	94
10 – Metro	No	6
Statewide	Yes	91
Statewide	No	9

Table 30. “Did you reduce from previous applications, the rate per acre of any corn herbicide?” (Q.33)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Reduced Rate from Previous Applications	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	44
1 – Northwest Red River	No	56
4 – Central Sands	Yes	39
4 – Central Sands	No	61
5 – East Central	Yes	39
5 – East Central	No	61
6 – West Central	Yes	26
6 – West Central	No	74
7 – Southwest	Yes	35
7 – Southwest	No	65
8 – South Central	Yes	31
8 – South Central	No	69
9 – Southeast	Yes	42
9 – Southeast	No	58
10 – Metro	Yes	50
10 – Metro	No	50
Statewide	Yes	36
Statewide	No	64

Table 31. “Did you select an herbicide with a different mode of action to reduce weed resistance to herbicides?” (Q.34)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Selected Herbicide with Different Mode of Action to Reduce Weed Resistance	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	100
1 – Northwest Red River	No	0
4 – Central Sands	Yes	80
4 – Central Sands	No	20
5 – East Central	Yes	50
5 – East Central	No	50
6 – West Central	Yes	82
6 – West Central	No	18
7 – Southwest	Yes	81
7 – Southwest	No	19
8 – South Central	Yes	91
8 – South Central	No	9
9 – Southeast	Yes	77
9 – Southeast	No	23
10 – Metro	Yes	75
10 – Metro	No	25
Statewide	Yes	83
Statewide	No	17

Table 32. “Did you choose a particular herbicide to reduce impacts to surface water or groundwater?” (Q.35)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Chose Herbicide to Reduce Impact to Surface or Groundwater	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	33
1 – Northwest Red River	No	67
4 – Central Sands	Yes	46
4 – Central Sands	No	54
5 – East Central	Yes	56
5 – East Central	No	44
6 – West Central	Yes	39
6 – West Central	No	61
7 – Southwest	Yes	46
7 – Southwest	No	54
8 – South Central	Yes	40
8 – South Central	No	60
9 – Southeast	Yes	46
9 – Southeast	No	54
10 – Metro	Yes	56
10 – Metro	No	44
Statewide	Yes	43
Statewide	No	57

Table 33. “Did you band herbicide applications to reduce use?” (Q.36)

Pesticide Monitoring Area	Banded Herbicide Applications to Reduce Use	Percent of Respondents
1 – Northwest Red River	Yes	6
1 – Northwest Red River	No	94
4 – Central Sands	Yes	14
4 – Central Sands	No	86
5 – East Central	Yes	11
5 – East Central	No	89
6 – West Central	Yes	8
6 – West Central	No	92
7 – Southwest	Yes	9
7 – Southwest	No	91
8 – South Central	Yes	6
8 – South Central	No	94
9 – Southeast	Yes	12
9 – Southeast	No	88
10 – Metro	Yes	19
10 – Metro	No	81
Statewide	Yes	9
Statewide	No	91

Appendix 1. Survey Form

Annual Pesticide Survey: Herbicide Applications and Practices on Corn for the 2014 Growing Season

1. Did you grow corn on your operation in 2014?
(Exclude sweet corn and popcorn)

Yes No - conclude interview

2. How many corn acres were planted for field corn in 2014?

General Information

3. On your 2014 corn acres, did you:

Apply herbicides yourself 1

Have herbicides custom applied? 2

Both? 3

Don't use herbicides [conclude interview] 4

4. Do you know the active ingredients of the herbicides you used on corn acres in 2014?

Yes = 1 No = 3 Some = 5

5. Do you keep herbicide application records on your farm?

Yes = 1 No = 3 Some = 5

6. Do you usually read the label for pesticide products applied on your farm?

Yes = 1 No = 3

Atrazine Specific Questions

7. Was Atrazine applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?

Yes = 1 (go to 10) No = 3 (go to 12) Don't Know = 5

8. Do you know the products applied to your corn acres in 2014?

Yes = 1 No = 3

9. Were any of the following products applied on your corn acres in 2014?

**Computer list of products used

Yes = 1 No = 3 (go to 12)

10. Was Atrazine incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?

Yes = 1 No = 3 I Don't Know = 5

11. Did you make more than one application of Atrazine to the same corn field in 2014?

Yes = 1 No = 3 I Don't Know = 5

Acetochlor Specific Questions

12. Was Acetochlor applied on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?

Yes = 1 (go to 15) No = 3 (go to 17) Don't Know = 5

13. Do you know the products applied to your corn acres in 2014?

Yes = 1 No = 3 (go to 17)

14. Were any of the following products applied on your corn acres in 2014?

**Computer list of products used

Yes = 1 No = 3 (go to 17)

15. Was Acetochlor incorporated on any of your corn acres in 2014, premixes included?

Yes = 1 No = 3 Don't Know = 5

16. Did you make more than one application of Acetochlor to the same corn field in 2014?

Yes = 1 No = 3 Don't Know = 5

The Following Questions Ask About how Decisions are Made Regarding Your Herbicide Program.

17. Who decides what products to apply?

- I do (the farmer)? 1
Dealer/Crop consultant? 3 Enter Code
Both together? 5

18. Who decides when to apply the herbicides?

- I do (the farmer)? 1
Dealer/Crop consultant? 3 Enter Code
Both together? 5

19. Who scouts your fields?

- I do (the farmer)? 1
Dealer/Crop consultant? 2 Enter Code
Both together? 3
Fields not scouted? 4

20. Setbacks or restrictions are part of many pesticide labels. Who determines if applications setbacks or restrictions are appropriate on your farm?

- I do (the farmer)? 1
Dealer/Crop consultant? 2 Enter Code
Both together? 3
Neither? 4

Scouting for Weeds and Related Practices

21. Has someone mapped weed infestations in any of your corn fields in the last three years?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

22. Do you choose herbicides based on type of weeds and/or density of weeds?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

Soil and Water Resources

23. Do you know the soil texture of your farm?

Yes = 1 No = 3

24. Do you know the organic matter level of your farm's soils?

Yes = 1 No = 3

25. Do you know the depth to the water table in your fields?

Yes = 1 No = 3

26. Is the water table at a depth greater than 30 feet?

Yes = 1 No = 3 (go to 29) Don't Know = 5 (go to 29)

26 a. If yes, how was the depth primarily determined? (Check one)

Well driller for drinking water	1	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Local knowledge	2	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>Enter Code</u>
A dealer, consultant or crop advisor	3	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Well log	4	<input type="checkbox"/>	
None of the above	5	<input type="checkbox"/>	

27. Are any streams, lakes or other surface waters immediately adjacent to or in your corn fields?

Yes = 1 No = 3 (if no go to 29)

28. Are there filter strips or vegetative buffers on any of these acres?

Yes = 1 No = 3 (if no go to 29)

28 a. If YES, were they required as part of a conservation program?

Yes = 1 No = 3

29. Do you irrigate corn?

Yes = 1 No = 3 (if no go to 32)

If, yes,

29 a. Do you have an irrigation water management plan?

Yes = 1 No = 3

30. What type of tillage did you use before planting on the majority of your corn acres? (Fall and Spring)

- Conventional < 15 residue 1
- Reduced Tillage 15 – 30? 2
- Conservation Tillage > 30? 3
- Strip Tillage 4
- No Tillage 5

Enter Code

General Practices for Corn Acres Only

31. Do you use precision applications for herbicides (variable rate applications)?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

32. In general, do you alternate use of herbicide products to keep weeds from becoming resistant to herbicides?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

33. Did you reduce from previous applications, the rate per acre of any corn herbicide?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

34. Did you select an herbicide with a different mode of action to reduce weed resistance to herbicides?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

35. Did you choose a particular herbicide to reduce impacts to surface water or groundwater?

- Yes = 1 No = 3

36. Did you band herbicide applications to reduce use?

- Yes = 1 No = 3