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Introduction/Conceptual Framework

Each year peanut producers have to determine which peanut cultivar to plant. Peanut producers plant peanut cultivars which have a history of producing high yields per acre in their production area. This is traditionally determined by the producer’s personal experience with selected cultivars or the experience a neighboring farmer has had in recent years. In North Florida 80% of the peanuts produced over the past four years have been the cultivar, GA06G (Tillman, 2013). University of Florida Peanut Breeder Dr. Barry Tillman not only creates new cultivars of peanuts but also conducts on-farm trials in different parts of the state to determine which cultivar produces the best yields and performs the best under various growing conditions. For the past two years this county extension agent has worked with Dr. Tillman in order to conduct a peanut cultivar trial here in Hamilton County. Four peanut cultivars are selected and planted in four replications consisting of six row strips through the participating producer’s field. Three to five acres of each cultivar are planted depending on the length of the rows. The producer then manages the trial along with the rest of his field. At harvest the yield is recorded and the grade is collected from each replication in order to determine the cultivar which has performed the best in the on-farm trial. This information is then presented at the Hamilton County Peanut Production Meetings during the following year in order to discuss the new cultivars which perform the best in their production area. Peanut producers could use the information generated from on-farm trials “to devise a plan that uses several varieties to spread risk of losses from disease. This information also helps in choosing varieties based on their relative maturity and disease resistance to help spread harvest and planting operations over a longer period” (Tillman, Gomillion, McKinney, Person, & Thomas, 2010, para. 9). Peanut companies which purchase peanuts from peanut shellers are starting to require peanut producers
to plant cultivars with high oleic oil chemistry in which the GA06G’s only have normal oleic oil chemistry (Beasley, 2013). This means peanut producers will have to plant different cultivars of peanut in order to continue marketing their crop to the peanut sheller. The cultivars which were planted in the on-farm trials over the past two years consisted of two cultivars which had the high oleic oil chemistry. Research conducted to determine what influences the cultivars peanut producers select at planting could lead to developing alternative educational materials for presenting on-farm trial data.

Producers are also faced each year with peanut foliar and soilborne diseases. These diseases include early and late leaf spot, rust, web blotch, southern blight, Sclerotina blight, Rhizoctonia limb rot, and Cylindrocladium black rot. In order to control foliar peanut disease farmers should “follow an appropriate crop rotation scheme, use an appropriate peanut cultivar, and adhere to well-timed fungicide programs” (Mueller, Wise, Dufault, Bradley, & Chilcers, 2013, p. 64). University of Florida Plant Pathologist Nicholas Dufault is concerned with developing peanut fungicide programs consisting of different modes of action in order to avoid fungicide resistance. “Peanut farmers are strongly encouraged to practice careful resistance management to prolong the use of currently available fungicides” (Mueller, Wise, Dufault, Bradley, & Chilcers, 2013, p. 64). In order to aid peanut producers with determining appropriate peanut fungicide programs this agent has conducted two peanut fungicide on-farm trials with the assistance of Dr. Nicholas Dufault. These on-farm trials were conducted using four different fungicide programs representing four different chemical companies. Each program was replicated four times throughout a local producer’s peanut field. The trials over the past two years were each approximately forty acres and were treated on a by-weekly bases consisting of seven chemical applications. The trial is randomly scouted throughout the growing season to
determine any discrepancies and at harvest the yield and grade is recorded from each replication in order to determine which fungicide program performed the best in the on-farm trial. This information is also presented at the Hamilton County Peanut Production Meetings during the following year in order to discuss the fungicide programs which performed the best in their production area. Peanut producers could use the information generated from this on-farm trial to properly manage peanut diseases which have created peanut yield losses in the past. Research conducted to determine what influences the fungicide program producers select during the peanut growing season could lead to developing alternative educational materials for presenting on-farm trial data.

Trade and Whitiker conducted research to compare different adult learning styles in order to determine how young farmers preferred to learn. “Beginning farmers expressed a high level of agreement for experiential learning, production agriculture skill development, and hands-on problem-solving. Respondents also agreed that problem-solving involving mental activities (critical thinking) should be used and that a variety of teaching methods should be incorporated into their education” (Trade & Whitaker, 1998, Findings, para. 3). On-farm trials provide the producers with experiential and hands-on problem-solving learning styles which should persuade peanut producers to plant new cultivars. This study will determine if peanut producers prefer experiential learning experiences which will support the need to continue performing on-farm trials in the future.

**Purpose and Objectives**

The purpose of this study is to determine what influences peanut producers to plant the cultivars they select to plant each year and which peanut fungicide program they should choose. This will help county extension agents prepare for future programs and determine if the
information presented in the Hamilton County Peanut Production Meetings is beneficial to the peanut producers. Data from the county on-farm trials is used in these production meetings to persuade producers to incorporate new peanut cultivars into their production program and to establish fungicide spray programs which reduce fungicide resistance. It is hypothesized that local peanut producers rely on information from neighboring farmers when determining peanut cultivar selection at planting and determining what fungicide to use during the growing season. This study will provide the information needed to help extension agents create materials needed to present the peanut producers with information on cultivar and fungicide selection based on the on-farm trial data collected in Hamilton County. The purpose of this study will be accomplished through the achievement of the following objectives.

1. To determine how peanut producers select the peanut cultivar to be planted each year.
2. To determine how peanut producers select the peanut fungicides used each year.
3. To determine what teaching materials could persuade peanut producers to try new peanut cultivars.
4. To determine what teaching materials could persuade peanut producers to try peanut fungicide programs which consist of seven applications.
5. To determine what benefits peanut producers receive from attending peanut production meetings with data offered from the Hamilton County on-farm trials.

**Definition of Terms**

1. **Crop rotation** – The practice of growing a series of dissimilar crops in the same area in sequential seasons.

2. **Foliar peanut disease** – Disease which affects the peanuts canopy. Early and late leaf spot are the most destructive foliar disease in peanuts.
3. Fungicide – A biological compound or organism used to kill or inhibit fungi or fungal spores.

4. Grade - At a peanut shelling company buying station, peanuts are sampled and graded by the Federal-State Inspection Service to determine their value. The inspectors establish the meat content, size of pods, kernel size, moisture content, damaged kernels and foreign material. The results of the inspection determine the overall quality and value of each individual load of peanuts.

5. Harvest – Appropriate time to invert and pick peanuts.

6. Incorporate - To unite or work into something already existent, to blend or combine thoroughly.

7. Maturity – When the peanut has reached the optimum size and age for harvest.

8. Oleic Oil Chemistry - A primary functional benefit of high-oleic oils is an extended shelf life in food Applications, as these oils are less susceptible to lipid oxidation due to the reduction in the total number of double bonds compared to traditional oils.

9. On-Farm Trial – Trial used to present ideas for comparing the performance of varieties on a "farm scale" that will give peanut growers tools to accurately evaluate peanut varieties on their own farm.

10. Peanut Cultivar - plant variety produced by breeding: a variety of a cultivated plant that is developed by breeding and has a designated name.

11. Replication - is the repetition of an experimental condition so that the variability associated with the phenomenon can be estimated.

12. Resistance - A plant that has the ability to resist certain types of diseases while other varieties of the same plant are typically susceptible.
13. Soilborne Peanut Disease – Disease which affects the peanuts roots or stem below the canopy. White mold is the most destructive soilborne peanut disease.

14. Yield – Amount of peanuts produced per acre normally recorded in pounds or tons.

Limitations and Assumptions

In order to obtain more participation from peanut producers in completing evaluations at the end of peanut production meetings a Likert-type scale was designed. The main limitation of the Likert-type scale is that it is only able to measure whether the respondents are more or less favorable to a relevant subject. This scale fails to measure why the producers agree or disagree with the statements. The ease of answering this kind of survey may also lead to unreliable answers. The trustworthiness of the producers could be questioned due to the inability to determine whether the producers actually read the statements or not. This study assumes that each producer who fills out an evaluation at the end of production meetings will read the statements on the evaluation, reflect on the meeting, and answer each statement truthfully.

Significance of this Study

Determining the most appropriate teaching method in order to teach producers the latest trends in peanut production is important when trying to motivate producers to incorporate new peanut production methods into their production systems. A study conducted by Trade and Whitaker state that “beginning farmers expressed a high level of agreement for experiential learning, production agriculture skill development, and hands-on problem-solving” (Trade & Whitaker, 1998, Findings, para. 3). If this study suggests that producers learn most effectively through experiential learning styles it will provide the needed support to continue on-farm trial research.
Theoretical Framework

Each year peanut producers are faced with decisions which will have an impact on their total peanut yield and grade which will affect the net profit that producer will earn. The most important decisions that will affect the producer’s net profit are peanut cultivar selection and what fungicide program to use. In Hamilton County, peanut on-farm trials are used to demonstrate how four cultivars perform and how four fungicide programs prevent peanut disease under similar conditions to the producer’s production area. When examining what influences the producer’s decision to plant a certain cultivar or spray a particular fungicide their learning style must be explored in order to determine what teaching method would be most appropriate to introduce new information which should be considered. Hansen states that “experiential learning theory defines learning as the process where knowledge is created through concrete experience and abstract conceptualization and transformed through reflective observation and active experimentation in a cyclical manner that continues until the conclusion of the project” (Hansen, 2012, p. 30).

Trade and Whitiker suggest that most agricultural producers prefer to learn through experiential learning methods. Producers prefer to adopt new production methods through experience in which extension personnel must adapt experiential teaching techniques in order to reach these producers and motivate them to try new production techniques. Paassen, Ridder, and Stroosnijder state that “first-order learning (experiential learning) is about the reduction of uncertainty. Uncertainty is reduced when someone acquires more details, necessary to arrive at a desired goal. This learning concerns observation, experimentation, and exchange of information to add elements, refine or extend one’s knowledge about an issue-at-stake and how to solve it” (Paassen, Ridder, & Stroosnijder, 2011, p. 211). In order to reduce the uncertainty of new peanut
production practices the on-farm trials should be used by the producers to increase their knowledge of peanut cultivars and fungicides.

Ndoye’s study suggests that “professional skills are usually updated through engagement in active learning by connecting prior experiences to new ones and also sharing information with others through reflection and hands-on activities” (Ndoye, 2003, p. 353). After performing a study on 126 farmers Ndoye supports the idea that farmers learn through experiential learning and suggest that most farmers should be given the opportunity to reflect on prior experiences when determining new production methods.

Kolb defines experiential learning as "the process whereby knowledge is created through the transformation of experience. Knowledge results from the combination of grasping and transforming experience" (Kolb 1984, p. 41). In the model provided, Kolb identifies four stages of the learning process (Figure 1). This model provides the theoretical framework for the current study.

The four stages listed in the model are concrete experience (learning by feeling), reflective observation (learning by reflecting), abstract conceptualization (learning by thinking), and active experimentation (learning by doing). Concrete experience relates to the practical experience of the producer or knowledge which is gained through acquaintances. Reflective observation concentrates on what the experience means to the producer. If the producer is interested in the topic being discussed he will be motivated to concentrate on the topic being discussed. Abstract conceptualization is the stage where the producer will learn from the new experience. Active experimentation is the stage where the learner applies what has been learned to a real world situation. Effective learning is achieved when the learner progresses through the
entire cycle. The learner will have a concrete experience followed by reflection of the experience which leads to generalizations or conclusions of the experience which are then used to test the situation resulting in a new experience. The four learning styles which are based on the four-stage learning cycle are diverging, assimilating, converging, and accommodating. Kolb (1981) discusses the differences in the four learning styles. A diverging learner will prefer to watch rather than do. They perform better in situations that require the generation of ideas such as brainstorming. Assimilating learners require good clear explanations and would prefer to read or be lectured to. Someone with a converging learning style would prefer to find solutions to practical issues with the information they have learned and like to experiment with new ideas. The accommodating learner is hands-on and relies on intuition. This type of learner also relies on others for information and will react on instinct rather than logical analysis.

![Model of Experiential Learning Process](image-url)

Literature Review

Relevant and current research which has been conducted on experiential learning suggests that it is an important learning style to consider when teaching students and adults. In order to determine what teaching methods agriculture agents must learn to use they must first determine what learning style their clientele posses.

Research performed by Curtis and Mahon (2010) suggest that fieldwork projects enhance student learning and provide real world experiences which incorporate experiential learning. These researchers used a survey and a student interview in order to generate the data collected to show the repose of agriculture students in college which have been assigned a project incorporating experiential learning styles.

Roberts (2006) examined the experiential learning theory and described experiential learning as a cyclical process defined by theory. Roberts recommended that researchers should use this model in order to guide inquiry into practice.

Baker, Robinson, and Kolb (2012) consider experiential learning as a critical component to the comprehensive agricultural education model. They explain that experiential learning builds meta-cognitive skills and can be goal-oriented. These authors suggest that in order to successfully utilize the experiential learning theory the researcher must provide purposeful reflection, guide the learner toward abstraction, and provide an opportunity for the learners to experiment actively with their new found learning.
Methodology

Population and Sample

The population of this study consisted of the peanut producers in Hamilton, Suwannee, Madison, and Columbia counties in Florida and Lowndes and Echols counties in Georgia. Suwannee River Peanut is a buying point for McClesky Mills and is located in Hamilton County. An invitation to attend the peanut production meetings was sent to each of the producers who sell peanuts through this buying point. This generated an interest in the peanut meetings from the surrounding counties and assured that all producers who grow peanuts in the area were invited. The sample of the population evaluated consisted of the peanut producers in attendance at the Hamilton County Peanut Production Meetings which account for ninety percent of the peanut producers in the area. These producers were evaluated at the conclusion of the Hamilton County Peanut Production Meetings held on February 12, 2013 and September 10, 2013.

Research Design

This was a quantitative research design in which evaluations were used to determine what information on cultivar selection and fungicide programs was obtained and what teaching method was preferred for future meetings. Quantitative research allows the researcher to use an evaluation in order to collect data that can be used to justify future meetings to stakeholders. At the conclusion of the peanut commodity meetings the peanut producers were presented an evaluation and asked to return it on their way out of the meeting. During these meetings, pesticide continuing education units were also available at the end of the meeting and were
distributed once the evaluations had been completed and turned in. This motivated most of the producers to complete the evaluation in a timely manner.

Knowledge and satisfaction questions were answered by the producers with the use of a Likert-type scale in which 1 represented strongly disagree and 5 represented strongly agree. Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen state that “a Likert scale assesses attitudes toward a topic by presenting a set of statements about the topic and ask respondents to indicate for each whether they strongly agree, agree, are undecided, disagree, or strongly disagree” (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 209). This scale allowed the evaluator to score each producer and determine whether the producer had a negative or positive attitude toward the peanut meetings and experiential learning. This scale was also used to determine the overall efficiency of the peanut production meeting and was used to compare the traditional meeting held in February with the on-farm trial meeting held in September which consisted of differing teaching styles to determine which meeting was the most beneficial and what teaching style was preferred.

A qualitative approach to this study could also be considered as an alternative method used for collecting research for this study. The researcher visited peanut producers while they were planting peanuts and used an interview style evaluation in order to determine why they selected the peanut cultivar they were planting. In order to determine how the producers prefer to learn and what qualities of the peanut meetings they prefer, the interviewer also questioned their participation in the peanut production meetings offered through the extension office. This type of evaluation is more personal and the results would be more trustworthy when determining how the producers prefer to learn. However, this method is more expensive and time consuming when considering there are approximately sixty producers who attended the meetings and are from five counties. The sample for this approach was smaller in which only some of the
producers in Hamilton County were interviewed. This alternative method limits the number of producers interviewed which does not represent the population of peanut producers as well as the quantitative research method did.

**Data Collection:**

The data collection process for this study began when variables of interest were identified and a population and sample were defined. One variable of this study is concerned with identifying how agricultural producers learn. Each year producers determine what peanut cultivar to include in their production system. On-farm cultivar trials are used to conduct research in order to provide producers with a list of recently released cultivars to aid them in selecting one which will be beneficial to their production techniques. In order to present these data to producers in a way that will be accepted, an evaluation was designed to determine how these producers would prefer to receive this information. In order to create an evaluation in which numerical data can be used to identify the learning styles of peanut producers, a Likert-type survey was used. The information collected from this evaluation will be used by agriculture agents to design production meetings which will present new material to producers that will be accepted and incorporated into their production area.

**Data Analysis**

This scale allowed the researcher to determine each of the producers overall attitude and allowed the researcher the ability to compare the statements on the evaluation in order to determine the overall satisfaction level of each individual statement on the evaluation. Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen state that “the researcher does an item analysis to identify the best functioning items. The item analysis typically yields three statistics for each item: (1) an item
discrimination index, (2) the percentage of respondents marking each choice to each item, and (3) the item mean and standard deviation” (Ary, Jacobs, & Sorensen, 2010, p. 211). An item analysis was conducted on each of the items listed in the sample evaluation on the appendix page. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the measures of central tendency which will include the mean, median, and mode.

Findings

At the conclusion of the annual Hamilton County Peanut Production Meeting held on February 12, 2013 a Likert scale evaluation was presented to participants. Listed below in Table 1 are the topics which were asked in the evaluation. The participants were able to answer 1 for strongly disagree through 5 for strongly agree for each statement listed. The results are listed below along with the mean, mode, and median for each evaluation topic. Each of these topics were marked as somewhat agree and strongly agree by all of the participants indicating that the meeting was successful. In order to determine which topic rated the lowest in this evaluation one can select the topic with the lowest mean score which is 4.58. This topic included foliar and soil-born diseases presented by Dr. Nicholas Dufault. This indicates that this presentation could be improved in either content, presentation technique, or both.
### Table 1.
**Meeting Evaluation Results February 12, 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>55 Participants</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I increased my knowledge of peanut production methods - seeding rates, effects of tractor ground speed at planting, determining whether or not to replant from the presentation by Dr. Scott Tubbs, Cropping Systems Agronomist, University of Georgia?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I increased my knowledge in the area of Foliar and Soil-Born peanut diseases after the presentation from Dr. Nicholas Default, UF Plant Pathology?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I found the on-farm trial information presented by Keith Wynn, UF Extension Agent to be beneficial?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel that the topics discussed were relevant to my needs as a peanut producer.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I found the meeting and/or handouts useful to me.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the conclusion of the annual Hamilton County Peanut Cultivar and Fungicide On-Farm Trial Meeting held on September 10, 2013 a Likert scale evaluation was presented to participants. Listed below in Table 2. are the topics which were asked in the evaluation. The participants were able to answer 1 for strongly disagree through 5 for strongly agree for each statement listed. The results are listed below along with the mean, mode, and median for each evaluation topic. Each of these topics were marked as somewhat agree and strongly agree by all of the participants indicating that the meeting was successful. In order to determine which topic rated the lowest in this evaluation one can select the lowest mean score which is 4.89. This topic included peanut fungicide use presented by Dr. Nicholas Dufault. This indicates that the presentation could be improved in either content, presentation technique, or both.
Table 2.
Meeting Evaluation Results September 10, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>44 Participants</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I increased my knowledge in peanut cultivar selection.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I increased my knowledge in peanut fungicides.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I intend to apply the information learned in order to improve my peanut production program.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I increased my knowledge in the area of foliar and soil born peanut diseases.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Topics discussed were relevant to my needs as a peanut producer.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The presenters were knowledgeable in the subject matter.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The meeting and/or handouts will be useful for future reference.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

This study provided agricultural extension agents with information regarding agricultural producers learning styles. The data collected and analyzed explains what type of production meeting producers prefer and how programs should be presented to benefit their needs. This evaluation allows extension agents the material needed to justify using experiential teaching methods and discusses the importance of using on-farm trials to persuade producers to try new agricultural production techniques.

At the conclusion of each meeting an evaluation was presented to producers which were analyzed to determine the importance of each meeting. Both meetings received good scores on the evaluations leading one to believe that both were successful. Once the meeting scores were compared it was interesting to see that the mean score was higher on each of the questions.
answered from the on-farm trial evaluation. The meeting held in February was a traditional meeting which used power points to present material to peanut producers in a conference room which limited the producer’s participation. The second meeting held in September focused on an experiential teaching style. The material in the provided presentations for this meeting were covered but were not presented in a power point. The presenters provided this information in the field and allowed producers to discuss the material openly while viewing actual samples of disease problems and samples of different peanut cultivars. This project supports this agent’s hypothesis that producers prefer to learn through experiential learning styles.
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Appendix A

Meeting Materials

2013 Hamilton County Peanut Production Meeting, February 12, 2013.

Meeting Objectives

Objective 1:  Compare single row and twine row planting methods for production advantages and disadvantages.

Objective 2:  Identify soil born peanut diseases and preventive methods.

Objective 3:  Identify foliar peanut diseases and preventative methods.

Objective 4:  Create a spray schedule which will avoid fungicide resistance.

Objective 5:  Explain the importance tractor speed has on planting peanuts.

Objective 6:  Identify high yielding cultivars based on data from peanut on-farm trials.

Objective 7:  Identify successful fungicide programs based on data from peanut on-farm trials.
Program of Activities

6:00  Welcome and Introduction – Keith W. Wynn, Agriculture Agent, Hamilton County Extension, UF/IFAS

6:05  Meal -- Courtesy of Suwannee River Peanut
      Mike & Jill Adams, Larry Cunningham
      McCleskey Mills

6:30  Farm Programs Available for 2013
      Don Burnam, Farm Service Agency CED

6:40  Peanut Production Methods – Seeding Rates, Effects of Tractor Ground Speed at Planting, Determining whether or not to replant.
      Dr. Scott Tubbs, Cropping Systems Agronomist, University of Georgia

7:25  Managing Foliar and Soil-Borne Peanut Diseases
      Dr. Nicholas Dufault, Plant Pathology, University of Florida

8:10  Hamilton County Peanut On-Farm Trial Update
      Keith W. Wynn, Agriculture Agent, Hamilton County Extension, UF-IFAS

8:30  Comments – Joe West, Larry Cunningham, and/or Chris Cunningham – McCleskey Mills
      Mike Adams and/or Harrell Tyree – Suwannee River Peanut

8:40  Handbook Handout and Adjournment of Meeting

Two Private/Ag Row CEU will be given towards your pesticide license.
Seeding Rates

Row Pattern
- Twin rows have reduced intra-row plant competition since spaced further apart
- Seed plates rotate at slower speed than singles for more accuracy / less skips
- Greater stand establishment rate than singles:
  - 2011 data (2 locations)
  - Twins = 85%
  - Singles = 73%

Introduction
- Seed cost is one of the highest input costs growers face each year
- Maximized profit potential is a result of maximizing yield / grade with minimized input costs
- Adequate final plant stand is the goal
  - But what is considered "adequate"?

Georgia-06G (650 seed / lb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seed Rate (Seed / Ft)</th>
<th>Price $ / Lb</th>
<th>Plant Cost $ / Ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(112 lb / ac)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>$101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(134 lb / ac)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>$117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(156 lb / ac)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Georgia-06G (650 seed / lb)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Price $ / Lb</th>
<th>Diff per 1 SPF</th>
<th>$355 / ton</th>
<th>$500 / ton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>$16.50</td>
<td>93 #</td>
<td>66 #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>$19.80</td>
<td>112 #</td>
<td>79 #</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pounds of peanut needed to pay for additional seed
### Materials and Methods (2012)

**Ponder Farm — Tifton; Attapulgus REC**

- **Cultivars:**
  - Florida EP™ ‘113’
  - FloRun™ ‘107’
  - GA Greener
  - GA-06G
  - GA-07W
  - GA-09B
  - GA-10T

- **Seeding Rates:**
  - 5.2 SPF
  - 6.2 SPF
  - 7.1 SPF
  - 8.3 SPF

### Row Pattern

- Single Row has a broader range of optimum plant stand, and can often be achieved with seeding rates of 5.0 seed / ft
- Twin Row requires higher plant stands to maximize yield and realize benefits of reduced competition — seeding rates up to 7.0 seed / ft often profitable.

### Yield

**Tifton 2010-11**

### Summary

- Reducing seeding rate in Singles has greatest capacity for savings
- Difficult to get stand above 4 plants / foot in Singles regardless of seed rate
- Reduction in stand still occurs, but less pronounced and doesn’t impact yield

### Plant Stand vs. Yield

**Summary**

- Twin rows have historically outperformed Singles
- Reduced seeding rate in Twins has potential to reduce yields
- Twin rows already have reduced intrarow plant competition since spaced further apart to begin with
Introduction
- Traveling too fast at planting can lead to skips in stand.
- Many precision vacuum planters have speed dependent on pressure (RPM)
- Is speed or pressure (or combination) causing skips in stand?

Summary
- Tractor speed does influence accuracy of planter and resulting number of skips.
- Plant stand can lead to yield differences.
- The faster the speed at planting, the lower the plant stand at a given seed rate setting.
- Reduce speed by tractor gear, not by RPM (on PTO dependent planters)

Materials and Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tractor Gears:</th>
<th>Resulting Speeds:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 2</td>
<td>L2, 1700 = 2.0 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 3</td>
<td>L2, 2000 = 2.4 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low 4</td>
<td>L3, 1700 = 2.8 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3, 2000 = 3.2 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPM:Seed Plates:</td>
<td>L4, 1700 = 3.7 mph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1700 4000</td>
<td>L4, 2000 = 4.1 mph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary
- Seven of ten data sets (site x year x RPM setting) resulted in an economic advantage when the lowest speed was used compared to the highest speed.
- Extra 7 mins / acre (4-row equip.) to drop from 4.1 to 2.4 mph ($1.20 more), < 10 lb peanut pays for time
- When possible, slow down – it allows the equipment to perform optimally and will usually pay off.
Management of soil borne and foliar peanut diseases.

There were many peanut diseases present in Florida during the 2012 season.

There was a good amount of rainfall in most peanut production areas.
- High moisture conditions
- Cooler average temperatures

Environment was key to development of late leaf spot and CBR in some fields.

Climate outlook (Agroclimate)
- ENSO phase is neutral
  - Cold and warm winter spells
  - Near normal rainfall
  - In general too variable to predict

Watch the May and June soil temps: 85 to 92°F creates good Stem rot environments.

Soil borne peanut diseases to watch for in 2013.
Cylindrocladium Black Rot (CBR)
*Cylindrocladium crocatae*

- CBR was observed in 2013 in multiple fields
- Moisture from tropical storms important
- Sustained cold < 40 F reduces survival

2013 Live Oak FAWN winter data

- Min Daily Air Temps
- Min Daily Soil Temp

Temps currently are not cold enough to limit CBR inoculum.

If you had CBR, an early season application of Proline may be useful.

- Neocosmospora is a CBR look-a-like
- Common in Panhandle
- Not considered yield reducing.

Stem rot trials at PSREU Citra, FL

- 2 yrs of peanuts, 2011 inoculated
- Variety: GA-06G, low stand (2 plants/ft)
- High levels of Late Leaf Spot
  - Developed in late August
  - Low levels of rust and ELS
  - Higher incidence of TSWV (10 - 20%)
Variation in Proline timing had little effect on stem rot levels or yields.

All major spray programs were better than the untreated check.

It is important to rotate chemistries in your fungicide program:

- Tebuconazole did better when split by Abound vs. 4 block program
- Proline, Provost and Fontelis all controlled disease well.
- Abound was less effective at disease control
  - Performed better with Tebuconazole
  - Good rotational fungicide.

PSREU foliar disease trial
- Consecutive years with peanut
- Very low stem rot (< 1% per plot)
- Variety: Georgia 06-9
- "Skippy" stand
- TBAN (10-20% incidence)
All treatments better than the untreated check.

Spray Rate by Variety

3 Sprays 06-G

Rotating and mixing chemistries are critical steps to good late leaf spot control.

- Avoid a 4 block of Tebuconazole
- No indications Tilt Bravo provides better control
- Fontana, Provost and Abound provide good control.

AUDPC Late Leaf Spot
(LSD = 50.21)

Some varieties are better than others for late leaf spot resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>TSWV</th>
<th>Leaf Spot</th>
<th>White Mold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-06G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-07W</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Green</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tifguard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida-07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2012 On-Farm Trials

- Alachua Co.:
  - History of Stem Rot
  - 4 replications, ~1.8 acres
  - Variety: Georgia 06-9
  - Planting Date: 4/13/12

- Hamilton Co.:
  - Low levels of Stem Rot
  - 4 replications, ~10.5 acres
  - Variety: Georgia 06-9
  - Planting Date: 5/16/12

Alachua Co. disease data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Bayer</th>
<th>Syngenta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-20-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-22-12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Graph showing disease incidence]

Hamilton Co. spray schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5-20-12</td>
<td>Bayer</td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-13-12</td>
<td>Syngenta</td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-1-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-15-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-22-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-29-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-5-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% 3.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alachua Co. yield results

- Yield: Bayer > Syngenta
- Value of Crop: Bayer > Syngenta

Difference of ~367 lb per acre
Difference of ~$62 per acre

Hamilton Co. disease data

- Leaf Spot (LSD = 5.83)

![Graph showing disease severity]

Hamilton Co. yield results

- Crop Value (LSD = 74)

![Graph showing crop value comparison]
Southern rust can be observed on the leaf, ear and stalk of corn.

Pustules on upper leaf surface

Southern Corn Leaf Blight and Gray Leaf Spot can be serious problems.

Similar symptoms and it can often depend on hybrid, however both can cause significant yield losses.

2013 Fungicides for Corn

- Tilt (propiconazole): 2-4 fl oz/A
- Tebucon (tebuconazole): 6 fl oz
- Stratego (Tilt + trifloxystrobin): 7.0-12.0 fl oz/A
- Stratego YLD: (prothioconazole + trifloxystrobin)
- Quilt Xcel: Quadris (azoxystrobin)+ Tilt (10.5-14.0 fl oz/A)
- Headline (pyraclostrobin): 6.0 fl oz
- Headline AMP: (+ metconazole) 10 fl oz/A

2013 Fungicides for Corn

- EVITO 480 SC (fluoxastrobin) 2.0-5.7 fl oz/A
- Domark 230ME (tetraconazole) 4 to 6 fl oz/A
- Priyaor Xemium (fluaxaproxad+pyraclostrobin) 4- 5 fl oz/A

Registered in FL as of Jan. 1st, 2013
Fungicides will usually control both rusts and leaf blights. (check labels)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fungicide</th>
<th>Diseases Controlled</th>
<th>FRAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quadris</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quilt</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratego</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primaor</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilt</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern Corn Leaf Blight; Common &amp; Southern Rust; Gray Leaf Spot</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remember to rotate and avoid fungicide resistance.

Fungicide recommendations for corn depends on the situation.

- Question: “Do I need a fungicide on my crop?”
  - Robert Kemmerait, UGA: “MAYBE, and DON’T miss the opportunity if you do…”
  - Fungicides are beneficial if disease is present (i.e. irrigated corn)
  - Fungicides on average will save 5 bushels or more when disease is present.

Timing of application is critical to effective or profitable disease control.

Generally, V5/6 applications are too early for disease control & R2 may be too late.

**PSREU 2012 fall corn trial.**

VT seasons sprays did provide a yield 'bump', but southern rust was present.
2012 Peanut Variety and Fungicide Trial

Planting Date: May 15, 2012

Keith W. Wynn – Hamilton County Extension

Georgia 06G
Florida 07
Tifguard
Georgia 07W

Four Replications Each
6534 Acres Per Replication
2.6 Total Acres Per Variety
10.6 Total Acres Total

5/23/12 Germination After Eight Days
6/5/12 – 21 Days Old
Germination Counts at 28 Days Old on
6/12/12
GA 06G: 3.2/Foot
FL07: 3.3/Foot
Tifguard: 3.4/Foot
GA07W: 2.8/Foot

- Fungicide Trial
- Started on 6/19/12 Thirty five Days After Planting
- Four Replications Per Fungicide Treatment
- 24 Rows In Each Replication
- Ten Acres Per Replication
- 40 Acres Total Test
Hamilton County Fungicide Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Herbicide</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Price per Ton</th>
<th>Value per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dupont</td>
<td>3963</td>
<td>$387.31</td>
<td>$727.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngenta</td>
<td>4147</td>
<td>$384.63</td>
<td>$795.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizino</td>
<td>4082</td>
<td>$369.30</td>
<td>$748.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bayer</td>
<td>4555</td>
<td>$373.91</td>
<td>$813.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value per acre is based on the Peanut Price Schedule (Loan Value)

Hamilton County Variety Trial

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Yield</th>
<th>Price per Ton</th>
<th>Value per Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GA996</td>
<td>4429</td>
<td>$532.18</td>
<td>$601.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL07</td>
<td>4728</td>
<td>$510.31</td>
<td>$680.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tipguard</td>
<td>4078</td>
<td>$558.27</td>
<td>$718.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA37W</td>
<td>4612</td>
<td>$382.58</td>
<td>$882.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value per acre is based on the Peanut Price Schedule (Loan Value)

Yield Comparison Between 2011 and 2012

Price Per Acre

Thanks To:
Mike Adams - Adams Farms
Dr. Barry Tillman
Dr. Nicholas Dufault
## 2013 Hamilton County Peanut Production Meeting
### Survey/Evaluation February 12, 2013
### Hamilton County Extension Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLEASE RATE THE FOLLOWING:</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I increased my knowledge of peanut production methods - seeding rates, effects of tractor ground speed at planting, determining whether or not to replant from the presentation by Dr. Scott Tubbs, Cropping Systems Agronomist, University of Georgia?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I increased my knowledge in the area of Foliar and Soil-Born peanut diseases after the presentation from Dr. Nicholas Default, UF Plant Pathology?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I found the on-farm trial information presented by Keith Wynn, UF Extension Agent to be beneficial?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel that the topics discussed were relevant to my needs as a peanut producer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I found the meeting and/or handouts useful to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:
6. What topics do you suggest for future meetings?

7. Any additional comments:

Thanks

An Equal Opportunity Institution.
U.S. Department of Agriculture, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Florida, IFAS, Florida A&M University Cooperative Extension Program, and Boards of County Commissioners Cooperating.
Appendix C

Meeting Materials

2013 Hamilton County Peanut Cultivar and Fungicide On-Farm Trail Meeting, September 10, 2013.

Meeting Objectives

Objective 1: Identify soil born peanut diseases and preventive methods.

Objective 2: Identify foliar peanut diseases and preventative methods.

Objective 3: Create a spray schedule which will avoid fungicide resistance.

Objective 4: Identify the peanut cultivars which are available for purchase from local peanut seed retailers.

Objective 5: Identify peanut cultivars which exhibit high levels of oleic fatty acid chemistry.

Objective 6: Identify high yielding cultivars based on data from peanut on-farm trials.

Objective 7: Identify successful fungicide programs based on data from peanut on-farm trials.
Hamilton County Peanut Cultivar & Fungicide On–Farm Trial Meeting

UF/IFAS Extension Hamilton County

Tuesday, September 10, 2013

6:00 P.M.

Sponsor: Coggins Farm Supply

6:00 P.M.  Welcome and Introductions – Keith W. Wynn, Agriculture Agent, UF/IFAS Extension Hamilton County

6:05 P.M.  Meal – (UF/IFAS Extension Hamilton County, 1143 US Hwy 41 NW, Jasper, FL)
            Sponsored by Coggins Farm Supply

6:30 P.M.  Sponsor Comments – Gerald Coggins, Coggins Farm Supply

6:45 P.M.  Peanut Disease Identification and Control (Fungicide On-Farm Trial Field Tour)
            Dr. Nicholas Dufault, University of Florida, Plant Pathology
            Keith W. Wynn, Agriculture Agent

7:30 P.M.  New Peanut Cultivars, Insect Management, and Disease Resistance (Cultivars On-Farm Trial Field Tour)
            Dr. Barry Tillman, University of Florida, Peanut Breeding and Genetics
            Keith W. Wynn, Agriculture Agent

8:15 P.M.  Question/Answer Session

Call the UF/IFAS Extension Hamilton County at 386-792-1276 by Tuesday, September 3rd 4 pm if you plan to attend. (1.0 Private/Ag Row CEU will be given.)
Using On-Farm Trials To Manage soil borne and foliar peanut diseases.

Nicholas S. Dufault
Extension Specialist
Row Crops & Vegetables
Plant Pathology Department/IFAS
University of Florida

There were many peanut diseases present in Florida during the 2013 season.

Soil borne peanut diseases to watch for in 2013.

Cylindrocladium Black Rot (CBR)
Cylindrocladium crotalariae

- CBR was observed in 2013 in multiple fields
- Moisture from tropical storms important
- Sustained cold < 40 F reduces survival

If you had CBR, an early season application of Proline may be useful.

- Neocosmospora is a CBR look-a-like
- Common in Panhandle
- Not considered yield reducing.

Stem rot trials at PSREU Citra, FL

- 2 yrs of peanuts, 2011 inoculated
- Variety: GA-06G, low stand (2 plants/ft)
- High levels of Late Leaf Spot
  - Developed in late August
  - Low levels of rust and ELS
  - Higher incidence of TSWV (10 - 20%)
It is important to rotate chemistries in your fungicide program.

- Tebuconazole did better when split by Abound vs. 4 block program
- Proline, Provost and Fontelis all controlled disease well.
- Abound was less effective at disease control
  - Performed better with Tebuconazole
  - Good rotational fungicide.
Rotating and mixing chemistries are critical steps to good late leaf spot control.

- Avoid a 4 block of Telbuconazole
- No indications Tilt Bravo provides better control
- Fontalis, Provost and Abound provide good control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trade Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>FRAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fierce</td>
<td>Tiphia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durra</td>
<td>Crepidium</td>
<td>5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jumiant</td>
<td>Junciparthea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newline</td>
<td>Pythionato</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiphia</td>
<td>Tiphia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>Parganato/Tiphia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentry</td>
<td>Parganato</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purse</td>
<td>Tiphia/Chamaelevia</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tifguard</td>
<td>Tiphia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida-07</td>
<td>Tiphia</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gentile</td>
<td>Singhaparno/Clyar</td>
<td>9-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some varieties are better than others for late leaf spot resistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>TSWV</th>
<th>Leaf Spot</th>
<th>White Mold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-06G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia-07W</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Greener</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tifguard</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida-07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions?
2013 Hamilton County On-Farm Trial Meeting

• Germination Date Was May 23, 2013
• Germination Counts Were Conducted On June 19, 2013
  • PlotRun 107 3.8/ft.
  • GA-06G 3.3/ft.
  • FL07 3.6/ft.
  • TUFRunner 727 3.1/ft

Cultivar Trial Was Planted On May 17, 2013
• Four Replications Of Each Cultivar
  – PlotRun 107
  – GA-06G
  – FL07
  – TUFRunner 727

Fungicide Trial
• Each Replication Consists of 24 Rows
• Each Fungicide Tedarix Is Applied To Four Replications Totaling 10 Acres
• Four Fungicide Tests Total A 40 Acre Trial

---

Syngenta
• BrowoWS 24 oz/a + Monsoom 7.2 oz/a
  7/29/13 48 DAP
  7/26/13 65 DAP
  8/07/13 77 DAP
  8/21/13 91 DAP
  9/05/13 106 DAP
  9/19/13 120 DAP

Bayer
• Provost 10.7 oz/a 7/26/13 65 DAP
  8/07/13 77 DAP
  8/21/13 91 DAP
  9/05/13 106 DAP
  9/19/13 120 DAP
• Chlorothalonil 24 oz/a
### Nichino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>9 oz/a</td>
<td>7/09/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>7/26/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>65 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>8/07/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>77 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>8/21/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>91 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artisan</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>9/05/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>106 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>24 oz/a</td>
<td>9/19/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>120 DAP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DuPont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Application Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Headline</td>
<td>9 oz/a</td>
<td>7/09/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontelis</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>7/26/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontelis</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>65 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontelis</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>8/07/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontelis</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>77 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fontelis</td>
<td>16 oz/a</td>
<td>8/21/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>24 oz/a</td>
<td>91 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>9/05/13</td>
<td>106 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>9/19/13</td>
<td>120 DAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothalonil</td>
<td>24 oz/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2013 Hamilton County Peanut On-Farm Trial Meeting  
Survey/Evaluation September, 10, 2013  
Hamilton County Extension Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rate the following by circling the correct response.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I increased my knowledge in peanut cultivar selection.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I increased my knowledge in peanut fungicides.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I intend to apply the information learned in order to improve my peanut production program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I increased my knowledge in the area of foliar and soil born peanut diseases.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Topics discussed were relevant to my needs as a peanut producer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The presenters were knowledgeable in the subject matter.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The meeting and/or handouts will be useful for future reference.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING:**

8. What topics do you suggest for future meetings?

9. Any additional comments:

Thanks!!!