2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey Prepared by Joe Henggeler, Extension Agricultural Engineer Commercial Agricultural Program

Average irrigated acreage of those surveyed in 2001: 37 acres

Average acreage planned for irrigation in 2002: 932 acres

X 10.2% increase

- 57 % of new irrigated land will be fixed pivots
- 1 % of new irrigated land will be towable pivots
- 42 % of new irrigated land will be poly-pipe

I. Systems Used by Respondents

Furrow, rigid pipe	11 %	Center pivot, fixed	40 %
Furrow, poly-pipe	35 %	Center pivot, towable	7 %
Furrow, poly-pipe using surge	4%	Furrow, rigid using surge	3 %

II. Irrigation Costs

1. Fuel

Туре	%Area Using	Cost	Sample Size
LP Gas	19 %	\$ 8.89/acre	14
Diesel	47 %	\$11.49/acre	31
Electric	34 %	\$ 9.39/acre	21

2. Maintenance and Repairs

Table 1. Maintenance and Repair Cost, Bootheel of Missouri, 2001

	Per Farmer	Per Well	Per Acre
Wells	\$1,140	\$ 82.86	\$ 1.06
Pumps	\$1,509	\$ 184.94	\$ 2.51
System (average all types)	\$2,779	\$ 374.89	\$ 4.59
Total	\$5428	\$646.09	\$ 8.16
note: 79.4 acres/well site 10.8 wells per farmer			

III. Irrigation Scheduling

The percentage of corn, cotton, and soybean acreage using either *Arkansas Scheduler* computer program or Woodruff charts was 21%. Overall scheduling produced 16 bu/ac more corn, 121 lbs/ac more cotton, and 10 bu/ac more full season soybeans, but 3 bu/ac less double-crop soybeans then irrigators who did not use either method.. 32%, 17%, 16%, and 9% of corn, cotton, full-season soybean, and double-crop soybean producers, respectively, used scheduling. The number of years experience in irrigating did not appear to effect method used. Results can be seen in Table 2.

IV. Iron in Water

Respondents were asked to evaluate the irrigation water for each field as to its amount of iron by identifying it as "low", "medium", or "high". The amount to iron did not seem to effect yield very much; relative yields are seen in Table 3 (relative is the yield divided by the average sprinkler or average flood yield, as the case may be).

Crop	No scheduling method	Scheduling Met	hodologies	Difference between scheduling & not scheduling
		Ark. Scheduler computer program	Woodruff irrigation charts	
Corn	178.2 bu/ac 68% of users n=36 Yrs Irr = 23.3	188.5 bu/ac 19% of users n = 10 Yrs Irr = 20.0	203.1 bu/ac 13% of users n = 7 Yrs Irr = 21.9	+ 16.3 bu/ac 9 % increase
Cotton	954.2 lbs/ac 83% of users n = 24 Yrs lrr = 20.4	1094.5 lbs/ac 14% of users n = 4 Yrs Irr = 12.8	996.0 lbs/ac 3% of users n = 1 Yrs Irr = 2.0	+ 120.6 lbs/ac 13 % increase
Soybean	44.5 bu/ac 84% of users n = 36 Yrs Irr = 20.6	52.9 bu/ac 3 % of users n = 3 Yrs Irr = 22.0	56.0 bu/ac 9 % of users n = 4 Yrs Irr = 27.0	+ 10.2 bu/ac 23 % increase
Double Crop soybean	35.8 bu/ac 91% of users n = 21 Yrs Irr = 16.8	32.3 bu/ac 4% of users n = 1 Yrs Irr = 21.0	34.0 bu/ac 4 % of a users n = 1 Yrs Irr = 30.0	- 2.7 bu/ac 7 % decrease

Table 2. Yields of crops based on irrigation scheduling method employed, Sample sizes and
average years of irrigating experience

Table 3. Relative Yields of Corn, Cotton, & Soybeans Based on Sprinkled or Flood Irrigated and Iron Content of Water

_													
			CORN			COTTON				SOYBEANS			
Iron Amount in Water		Pivot		Flood	Flood		Pivot		Flood			Flood	
		RelYield	#	RelYield	#	RelYield	#	RelYield	#	RelYield	#	RelYield	#
	Low	1.01	7	0.83	1	0.92	3	1.01	1	1.18	3	0.82	3
	Medium	0.98	18	1.01	16	1.03	9	0.99	8	0.98	21	1.02	23
	High	1.05	5	1.01	4			1.03	3	0.90	2	1.01	9

V. Crop Cultural Practices

Deep-ripped:	56 %	(74%, 56% & 13 % for sand, silt & clay, respectively)
Limed:	69 %	(71%, 71% & 61% for sand, silt & clay, respectively)
Laser-leveled:	36 %	(8%, 55% & 42% for sand, silt & clay, respectively)
Minimum till:	61 %	(60%, 65% & 61% for sand, silt & clay, respectively)
Minimum till:	61 %	(43%, 79%, 52% & 91% for corn, cotton, soybean and d.c. soybeans, respectively)
Use of drain furrows:	58%	(47%, 67% & 48% for sand, silt & clay, respectively)

VI. Land Value Increase when Irrigation is Present

Irrigators were asked if irrigation on farm land increased the value of land. Compared to raw farm land the presence of

irrigation increased land value by:

- with a center pivot: \$355/ac, (n=39)
- with it being laser leveled: \$394/ac, (n=44)

Table 4a. Corn yield in bushels per acre for various soil types as affected by minimum tilling, deep ripping,liming, lasering, and use of surface drains, Southeast Missouri, 2001.

	Minimum Till		Deep l	Ripped	Lin	ned	Las	ered	Drain I	Furrow	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
clay/gumbo	183.6	172.0	145.0	184.1	170.8	187.8	146.0	199.2	161.3	190.0	
	n =5	n=3	n=1	n=7	n=4	n=4	n = 3	n = 5	n = 3	n = 5	
sand	180.5	188.7	184.5	186.7	185.7	181.3	185.0	185.0	181.4	188.4	
	n =12	n=15	n =21	n = 6	n =23	n=4	n = 5	n =22	n =13	n =14	
silt	175.8	182.3	184.4	174.7	182.5	177.5	187.7	176.5	181.2	179.4	
	n = 5	n=12	n=10	n=7	n=10	n=7	n = 6	n =11	n = 10	n = 7	
Other		225.0 n = 1		225.0 n = 1	225.0 n = 1			225.0 n = 1	225.0 n = 1		
AVERAGE	180.1	185.8	183.2	183.7	184.3	181.3	177.8	185.4	180.7	186.3	
	n=22	n=31	n=32	n=21	n=38	n=15	n=14	n=39	n=27	n=26	
AVERAGE YIELD CHANGE	-5	.7	-C	-0.4		+ 3.1		- 7.7		- 5.6	

Table 4b. Cotton yield in pounds of lint per acre for various soil types as affected by minimum tilling, deep ripping, liming, lasering, and use of surface drains, Southeast Missouri, 2001.

	Minimum Till		Deep R	ipped	Lim	led	Las	ered	Drain I	Furrow	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
clay/gumbo	967.0	985.5	981.5	975.0	981.5	975.0	985.5	967.0	967.0	985.5	
	n=1	n=2	n=2	n=1	n=2	n=1	n=2	n=1	n=1	n=2	
sand	958.7	1200.0	997.6	937.0	965.5	1036.5	984.8	972.4	941.0	995.3	
Sanu	n=13	n=2	n=9	n=6	n=12	n=3	n=4	n=11	n=6	n=9	
silt	947.0	700.0	907.0	900.0	927.5	862.5	905.8		1025.0	846.3	
Siit	n=5	n=1	n=5	n=1	n=4	n=2	n=6		n=2	n=4	
Other	1000.0	1025.0	1012.5		1012.5		1000.0	1025.0	1050.0	1000.0	
Other	n=2	n=3	n=4		n=4		n=2	n=3	n=2	n=3	
AVERAGE	960.2	1018.2	976.3	932.1	968.8	968.3	953.2	914.2	969.3	961.8	
AVENAGE	n=21	n=8	n=20	n=8	n=22	n=6	n=14	n=15	n=11	n=18	
AVERAGE YIELD CHANGE	- 5	8.0	+ 39	+ 39.2		+0.5		9.0	+ 16.7		

TABLE 4C. SOYBEAN YIELD IN BUSHELS PER ACRE FOR VARIOUS SOIL TYPES AS AFFECTED BY MINIMUM TILLING, DEEP RIPPING, LIMING, LASERING, AND USE OF SURFACE DRAINS, SOUTHEAST MISSOURI, 2001.

	Minim	um Till	Deep Ripped		Limed		Lasered		Drain I	Furrow
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
alay/aumba	47.6	49.7	55.5	47.6	49.8	46.5	49.8	47.3	48.1	48.5
clay/gumbo	n=9	n=4	n=1	n=12	n=7	n=6	n=8	n=5	n=7	n=6
sand	36.2	43.4	37.1	46.0	40.1	40.6	46.5	37.8	39.8	41.2
Sanu	n=6	n=8	n=9	n=5	n=9	n=5	n=4	n=10	n=9	n=5
silt	48.2	50.9	47.2	51.1	51.8	47.6	54.8	39.8	48.8	51.3
Siit	n=6	n=9	n=5	n=10	n=8	n=7	n=10	n=5	n=9	n=6
Other		45.0	45.0		45.0			45.0	45.0	
Other		n=1	n=1		n=1			n=1	n=1	
AVERAGE	44.5	45.6	41.9	48.6	46.8	45.3	51.1	40.9	45.4	47.3
AVENAGE	n=21	n=23	n=16	n=27	n=23	n=18	n=22	n=21	n=26	n=17

AVERAGE YIELD	1 1	67	. 1 5	10.2	2.0
CHANGE	- 1.1	- 0.7	± 1.5	+ 10.2	- 2.0

TABLE 4D. DOUBLE-CROP SOYBEAN YIELD IN BUSHELS PER ACRE FOR VARIOUS SOIL TYPES AS AFFECTED BY MINIMUM TILLING, DEEP RIPPING, LIMING, LASERING, AND USE OF SURFACE DRAINS, SOUTHEAST MISSOURI, 2001.

	Minimum Till		Deep	Deep Ripped Limed		ned	Las	ered	Drain	Furrow	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	
alay/aumba	25.3	42.0		29.5	26.0	33.0	31.5	27.5	27.5	31.5	
clay/gumbo	n=3	n=1		n=4	n=2	n=2	n=2	n=2	n=2	n=2	
sand	35.4	36.0	33.0	37.6	36.8	26.0	38.0	35.3	39.0	32.8	
	n=7	n=2	n=4	n=5	n=8	n=1	n=2	n=8	n=4	n=5	
ailt	40.7	32.3	37.3	41.0	46.7	35.4	41.0	29.2	39.8	39.6	
silt	n=7	n=1	n=3	n=5	n=3	n=5	n=2	n=6	n=2	n=6	
Other		32.1		32.1	32.1			32.1		32.1	
Other		n=1		n=1	n=1			n=1		n=1	
AVERAGE	35.8	35.7	34.5	36.5	37.0	33.6	36.8	35.6	36.3	35.5	
AVENAGE	n=17	n=5	n=7	n=14	n=14	n=8	n=6	n=17	n=8	n=14	
AVERAGE YIELD CHANGE	+ 0	.1	-	- 1.4		+ 3.4		+ 1.3		+ 0.6	

TABLE 5.-- 2001 BOOTHEEL IRRIGATION RESULTS

	CORN	COTTON	FC SOY	DC SOY	MILO
Number Reported	53	29	43	23	1
Acres Reported	6572	4416	4241	2402	95
# of Irrigations, furrow	5.2	3.6	3.9	3.6	
# of Irrigation, pivot	9.8	5.3	4.5	6.7	5.0
Irrigated Yield	183 bu	966 lbs	46 bu	36 bu	84 bu
Dryland Yield	119 bu	777 lbs	31 bu	21 bu	50 bu
Increase over Dryland	69.3 bu	184.4 lbs	5.2 bu	16.5 bu	34.0 bu

TABLE 6.--1987-2001 BOOTHEEL IRRIGATION SURVEYYields for Irrigated vs Dryland Crops and their Breakeven Costs

Year	lrrig. Corn (bu)	Non-Irrig. Corn (bu)	Irrig. Soybeans (bu)	Non-Irrig. Soybeans (bu)	Irrig. DC Soybeans (bu)	Non-Irrig. DC Soybeans (bu)	Irrig. Cotton (Ibs)	Non-Irrig. Cotton (Ibs)	lrrig. Milo (bu)	Non-Irrig. Milo (bu)
1987	149	121	44	32	33	19			110	101
1988	148	88	39	32	36	27	877	718	108	91
1989	152	117	37	27	29	23	807	605	92	77
1990	146	86	44	29	38	31	768	528	82	32
1991	143	84	42	29	43	30	917	678	105	69
1992	189	135	48	37	44	32	1029	990	121	108
1993	137	95	44	31	41	30	722	546	113	75
1994	162	123	47	38	43	37	933	779	101	93
1995	156	124	43	29	42	31	637	422	90	66
1996	170	124	43	32	42	25	905	719	98	63
1997	155	103	41	28	42	31	865	723	110	70
1998	140	95	37	22	40	27	692	542	82	
1999	163	121	49	21	43	17	787	471		
2000	171		43		39		733		140	

2001	183	119	46	31	36	21	966	777	84	50
	(\$2.17)*	(\$2.52)*	(\$5.92)*	(\$6.86)*	(\$7.57)*	(\$10.16)*	(\$0.50)*	(\$0.53)*	(\$3.20)*	(\$4.24)*
Avg	158	110	43	30	39	27	831	653	103	75

* Break-even price; after D. Reinbott. 2001. Crop Budgets: Southeast Missouri. Un-numbered report. University of Missouri *Outreach & Extension Service. Scott County.*

TABLE 7AIRRIGATED FULL-SEASON SOYBEAN YIELD (BU/AC)
2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey
Showing # of irrigations & Average Depth Applied

Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average
Son Type			Rigid Fipe		Average
Sand	37.7 (4.7 @ 0.8") n = 7	24.0 (1.0 @ 1.0") n = 1		46.0 (4.5 @ 2.3") n = 6	40.28 n = 14
Silt	48.3 (5.3 @ 1.1") n = 3	56.1 (6.0 @ 0.8") n = 1	52.0 (3.0 @ 2.4") n = 3	48.8 (3.4 @ 2.0") n = 8	49.83 n = 15
Clay/Gumbo	53.0 (5.0 @ 1.0") n = 1	45.0 (2.0 @ 0.8") n = 1	51.0 (2.5 @ 2.0") n = 2	47.5 (4.4 @ 2.6") n = 9	48.27 n = 13
Other				45.0 (4.0 @ 2.0") n = 1	45.00 n = 1
Average	42.00 n = 11	41.70 n = 3	51.60 n = 5	47.45 n = 24	46.12 n = 43
furrow users <u>with</u> furrow users <u>with</u>					

TABLE 7B.-- YIELD INCREASE (BU/AC) DUE TO IRRIGATION FOR FULL-SEASON SOYBEAN 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey

Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average	
Sand	8.7	2.0		14.2	10.58	
Sanu	n = 7	n = 1		n = 6	n = 14	
Silt	10.7	21.8	13.3	27.9	21.13	
Siit	n = 3	n = 1	n = 3	n = 8	n = 15	
Clay/Gumbo	13.0	5.0	8.5	20.4	16.82	
Clay/Gumbo	n = 1	n = 1	n = 2	n = 9	n = 13	
Other						
Average	9.64	9.60	11.40	21.39	16.28	
Average	n = 11	n = 3	n = 5	n = 23	n = 42	

TABLE 8A--IRRIGATED DOUBLE-CROP SOYBEANS YIELD (BU/AC) **2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey** Showing # of irrigations & Average Depth Applied

Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average
Sand	34.3 (10.3 @ 1.0") n = 6	38.0 (6.5 @ 1.0") n = 2		38.0 (6.0 @ 2.0") n = 1	35.53 n = 9
Silt	39.0 (5.0 @ 2.4") n = 3	37.6 (5.0 @ 0.7") n = 1	48.0 (2.0 @ 3.0") n = 1	38.1 (3.0 @ 2.7") n = 3	39.61 n = 8
Clay/Gumbo	27.5 (4.0 @ 1.2) n = 2			31.5 (4.0 @ 2.5") n = 2	29.50 n = 4

Other	32.0 (@) n = 1				32.00 n = 1		
Average	34.15 n = 12	37.87 n = 3	48.00 n = 1	35.88 n = 6	35.76 n = 22		
	furrow users <u>with</u> surge = 30.4 bu/ac (n=3) furrow users <u>without</u> surge = 43.0 bu/ac (n=4)						

TABLE 8B.-- YIELD INCREASE (BU/AC) DUE TO IRRIGATION FOR DOUBLE-CROP SOYBEAN 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey TABLE

2001 Bootheer Inigation Guivey TABLE					
Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average
Sand	17.8	15.0		18.0	17.48
Sanu	n = 6	n = 1		n = 1	n = 8
Silt	12.3	21.5	23.0	26.0	19.06
Siit	n = 3	n = 1	n = 1	n = 2	n = 7
Clay/Gumbo	6.0			12.0	8.00
Clay/Gumbo	n = 2			n = 1	n = 3
Other					
Average	14.18	18.25	23.00	20.50	16.53
Average	n = 11	n = 2	n = 1	n = 4	n = 18

TABLE 9A.--IRRIGATED CORN YIELD (BU/AC) 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey Showing # of irrigations & Average Depth Applied

Soil Type	Soil Type Fixed Pivot Tow-able Pivot Rigid Pipe Poly-pipe Average							
Son Type			Rigiu Fipe		Average			
Sand	184.3 (11.5@0.8") n=15	194.1 (10.7 @ 0.9") n=3		183.3 (6.0@2.2") n=9	185.03 n=27			
Silt	187.9 (7.3@1.6") n=6		188.0 (3.0@3.0") n = 1	175.2 (4.4 @ 2.4") n = 10	180.44 n=17			
Clay/Gumbo	204.0 (7.5@1.1") n=4	180.0 (4.0@0.8") n=1	175.0 (3.0@2.0") n=1	131.5 (7.5@2.5") n=2	179.25 n=8			
Other	225.0 (12.0 @ 1.5") n=1				225.0 n=1			
Average	189.66 n=26	190.60 n=4	181.5 n=2	174.51 n=21	183.42 n=53			
		iurrow users with surge =178.3 bu/ac(n=3) iurrow users without surge =174.7 bu/ac(n=20)						

TABLE 9B.-- YIELD INCREASE (BU/AC) DUE TO IRRIGATION FOR CORN 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey

	—				
Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average
Sand	85.8	100.7		78.14	84.90
Sanu	n=15	n=3	3	n=9	n=27
Silt	50.9		53.0	59.2	55.91
	n=6		n=1	n=10	n=17
Clay/Gumbo	45.5	15.0	10.0	55.0	39.63
Clay/Gumb0	n=4	n=1	n=1	n=2	n=8
Other	100.0 n=1				

Average	70.30	79.25	31.50	66.92	68.46
Average	n=26	n=4	n=2	n=21	n=52

TABLE 10A.--IRRIGATED COTTON YIELD (LB/AC) 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey Showing # of irrigations & Average Depth Applied

Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average		
Sand	972.4 (4.0 @ 6.0") n=11			984.8 (6.0@2.0") n=4	975.71 n=15		
Silt				905.8 (4.0@6.0") n=6	905.80 n=6		
Clay/Gumbo	967.0 (4.0 @ 6.0") n=1			985.5 (4.0 @ 6.0") n=2	979.33 n=3		
Other	1000.0 (4.0 @ 6.0") n=2			1016.7 (4.0@6.0") n=3	1010.02 n=5		
Average	974.25 n=14			959.67 n=15	967.53 n=29		
furrow users with surge = $1000.0 \text{ bu/ac}(n = 4)$							

furrow users <u>without</u> surge = 945.0 bu/ac(n = 11)

TABLE 10B.-- YIELD INCREASE (LB/AC) DUE TO IRRIGATION FOR CORN 2001 Bootheel Irrigation Survey

Soil Type	Fixed Pivot	Tow-able Pivot	Rigid Pipe	Poly-pipe	Average
Sand	194.1			122.3	174.96
	n = 11			n = 4	n = 15
Silt				195.8	195.80
				n = 8	n = 6
Clay/Gumbo	334.0			210.5	251.67
	n = 1			n = 2	n = 3
Other	125.0			125.0	125.0
	n = 2			n = 2	n = 4
Average	200			166.78	184.40
	n = 14			n = 16	n = 30