

Technical Data Report

Researcher: Scott Nissen, Ph.D.
Prepared by J.R. Martineau, Ph.D.
Edited by Pawel Wiatrak, Ph.D.
Director of Technical Services

Effects of Nutriplant™ AG on Pinto Bean Production

Objective

The objective of the trial was to determine the effect of Nutriplant AG on production of pinto beans.

Materials and Methods

A field trial was conducted on pinto beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L. cv. Remington) at the independently owned and operated agricultural research facility, Irrigation Research Foundation, in Yuma, Colorado, USA, under the supervision of Colorado State University. Pinto beans were planted at 222,300 seeds/ha (90,000 seeds/acre) in four 76 cm (30 inches) wide and 198 meters (650 feet) long rows on the following dates: June 11 in 1998, June 23 in 1999, June 1 in 2004 and June 4 in 2005. Two uniform plots were selected for each trial. One plot was treated with Nutriplant AG at 1.2 l/ha (16 fl oz/acre) at pre-bloom in 1999, 8-10 leaf stage in 2004 and 8-10 leaf stage and pod set (2 applications) in 2005. The control plot was left untreated. On July 10 in 1998, nitrogen was applied through the sprinkler irrigation system at a rate of 112 kg N/ha (100 lb N/acre). In 2004 and 2005, crop was fertilized with urea (including urease inhibitor) at 343 kg/ha (306 lb/acre) applied at 4.2 l/metric ton (1 gal/ton). Starter fertilizer (25-40-3-56-.02) was applied at planting at 159 l/ha (17 gal/acre) in 2004 and 2005. Weed control included Poast at 2.3 l/acre (32 oz/acre) and Copper-Count-N at 4.7 l/ha (64 oz/acre) in 1998, standard weed control in 1999, Dual at 1.2 l/acre (16 fl oz/acre) with Spartan at 0.15 l/ha (2 fl oz/acre) at planting in 2004, and Prowl with Outlook and Spartan herbicides at 2.3, 1.2 and 0.15 l/ha (32, 16 and 2 fl oz/acre), respectively in 2004 and 2005. Select, post-emergence herbicide, was used for weed control at a rate of 0.6 l/ha (8 fl oz/acre) in 2004 and 2005. Other cultural practices, including irrigation and pest management, followed local practices and were the same for treated and untreated plots. On July 7 in 1999, hail caused severe damage to plant stand and four additional hail storms in 2004 on May 10, June 20, and July 2 and 15, caused severe crop damage. Pinto beans were harvested on September 23 in 1998, October 13 in 1999, September 15 in 2004, and October 3 in 2005. Because of extensive hail-storm damage in 2004, crop yields from this year were not included.

Results

Application of Nutriplant AG to pinto beans at pre-bloom in 1998 and 1999, and in 2005 at the 8-10 leaf stage, and again at pod set, increased bean yields by 1352 kg/ha (1207 lb/acre) in 1998, 354 kg/ha (316 lb/acre) in 1999, and 374 kg/ha (334 lb/acre) in 2005 (Table 1).

Table 1. Influence of Nutriplant AG applied pre-bloom in 1998 and 1999, and 8-10 leaf stage and again at pod set in 2005 on pinto bean yields at Irrigation Research Foundation, Yuma, Colorado, USA.

Year	Grain yields of pinto beans						
	Control		Nutriplant AG		Difference		
	(kg/ha)	(lb/acre)	(kg/ha)	(lb/acre)	(kg/ha)	(lb/acre)	(%)
1998	2,378	2,123	3,730	3,330	1,352	1,207	56.9
1999	2,121	1,894	2,475	2,210	354	316	16.7
2005	3,113	2,779	3,487	3,113	374	334	12.0

Conclusion

Compared to the untreated control, Nutriplant AG increased yields with pre-bloom applications in 1998 by 56.9% and by 16.7% in 1999. In 2005, application of Nutriplant AG at the 8-10 leaf stage and again at pod set improved yields by 12.0%. On average, Nutriplant AG increased yields of pinto beans by 28.5%.