

***Wheat Day on May 27th—8:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m. at  
L.A. Royal's Farm (2 CEU's)***

**Third round of EQIP application deadline is May 16.**

**Attention—2013 ACRE**

Participation in 2013 ACRE requires production reports for planted acres that must be submitted for the covered commodities and peanuts planted on the farm by July 15, 2014.

Failure to report production for those covered commodities and peanuts planted on ACRE farms may result in contract termination. If the contract is terminated, all payments, including direct pay-

Cool bean. Livestock Feed Program sign up ends Jan, 2015 but it is strongly recommended to have applications completed by Sept 2014. Farms that participated in ACRE for 2013 have to turn in production records by July 15, 2014 or be subject to paying back the money received for DCP on that Farm.

Ag Committee Meeting—June 24th Noon  
at the Hale County Extension Office.



## Grain Sorghum vs. Corn in Drought & Heat Conditions: Part II

This continues a series to examine production of grain sorghum vs. corn in relation to dryland and limited water conditions as well as water-use efficiency of grain sorghum vs. corn.

A producer posed a question this week. He knows full well about the ‘battle’ between corn and grain sorghum for acreage. He knows, too, that corn hybrid defense traits (insects, herbicide tolerance), so-called drought tolerant traits, and yield gains available in corn hybrids have exploded in the past 10 years or so—all improvements—so he asked:

*“In your opinion, are current grain sorghum hybrids capable of producing higher yields than most farmers are getting? If so, why? Is it just the weather, or is it partly due to management factors?”*

Yes, hybrids *are* capable of producing higher yields than sorghum farmers may receive. The commitment to higher yielding grain sorghum production seems to have waned over the years. Statistics suggest U.S. grain sorghum yields have been only a little above flat for up to 30 years. The typical acre of grain sorghum production today, however, is likely on slightly more marginal ground than 20 and 30 years ago. Furthermore, producers have been more reluctant to put inputs into the crop in part because grain sorghum prices are lower than for corn—but these inputs are lower, too.

The psychology of farming tends to focus on grossing the most money you can per acre rather than the net return or the risks you take. Yes, farmers may feel that the more income dollars they roll through their operation the better their management skill comes into play, and the more likely they can increase profitability.

Also, sorghum’s fit is more appropriate relative to corn where moisture is limiting (rainfall or irrigation), so grain sorghum tends to experience a more pronounced ‘limited irrigation’ or ‘deficit irrigation’ or ‘limited input’ production system (relative to corn).

Grain sorghum hybrid yield potential has improved, but higher yields—*in contrast to more efficient yields*—are not being realized on many farms. Perhaps we could argue that sorghum shouldn’t be gunning for higher yields on an absolute or maximum basis. For those producers who make the decision to favor heavier inputs on grain sorghum, modern hybrids will respond, but the days are largely gone when a farmer will pour 20” of irrigation or 250 lbs. N per acre or maximize some other input to grain sorghum.

Many producers in 2013 learned that their county T-yield for corn (especially if irrigated) were double or more that of grain sorghum. This represents a willingness to enhance inputs on corn for maximizing yield or income, but also ‘crappy farming’ when folks don’t take care of their grain sorghum, maybe irrigate it only a little if (if available) and perhaps didn’t apply any nitrogen at that—and used a too high seeding rate as if they were.

It is not the weather! Seed companies have been doing their best to increase yield potential, and markets move up and down like they always have, but I think we would all agree that farming is probably more risky than it used to be. And for this reason I believe sorghum has an essential role on many farms in Texas and beyond.

## Grain Sorghum vs. Corn in Heat & Drought Conditions—Part III

This continues a series to examine production of grain sorghum vs. corn in relation to dryland and limited water conditions as well as water-use efficiency of grain sorghum vs. corn.

Water use efficiency (WUE) is debated frequently among research, educators, and producers. When you read reports in research and farm publications, sometimes either of two mistakes are made in the data and discussion—Results are given and discussed for:

- Total crop yield divided by total water
- Total yield divided by irrigation water applied

The flaw in each is, in the first case, there is a certain amount of water required (stored soil moisture, rainfall, irrigation) to achieve that first bushel of grain yield per acre. In the second case, the flaw dismisses the contribution of soil moisture and rainfall.

From an agronomic perspective, we want to know the following:

*What is the incremental change (increase) in yield per unit of available water?*

Again, from an agronomic perspective, we also often overlook this:

*How much available water does it take to produce that first bushel of grain?*

If you get an additional 2” of rain (one rain, or over the course of the season) on your crop, what is the increase in yield? If you use an additional 2” of irrigation, what is the yield increase due to that water?

In the first question corn grain yield is greater than grain sorghum, but in the second grain sorghum has a strong advantage over corn.

There are many factors to discuss, and I will begin that in our next Sorghum Tip.



## Grain Sorghum vs. Corn in Drought & Heat Condition: Part V

This continues a series of Sorghum Tips discussing production yield of grain sorghum vs. corn in relation to dryland and limited water conditions as well as water-use efficiency of grain sorghum vs. corn. Previously in Part IV I demonstrated a relative albeit simplistic comparison of yield vs. seasonal water use for grain sorghum vs. corn which emphasized two points:

- *What is the incremental change (increase) in yield per unit of available water?*
- *How much available water does it take to produce the first bushel of grain?*

Although corn generally yields more per unit of water than grain sorghum—once sufficient water is present to achieve grain yield for each crop—the important consideration for grain sorghum, however, is that grain sorghum can produce grain yield at moisture levels (lower) that corn cannot. K-State Research & Extension frequently and generally notes in Kansas that when corn yields fall below 100 bu/A that sorghum generally becomes the more favorable cropping option.

But what about the price of the corn or grain sorghum you receive in the market (this Tip's discussion)? And what about the cost to produce the corn or grain sorghum (the next TGSA Tip)? These factors will influence the simple comparison I portrayed in the Part IV tip, which was based only on yield. I have reconstructed the original graph in Part IV to now reflect crop value of grain sorghum and corn using the same yield per inch as before. I have used \$4.50/bu for corn and \$4.00/bu for grain sorghum (approximate High Plains contract prices as of February 2014), but of course these prices change: 1) in absolute value (prices per bushel go up and down), and 2) the price differential varies (and may be closer together on the Texas Gulf Coast?)

Remember, the above figure is based on **crop value**. Due to corn's higher price and higher yield per unit of water, you can see that compared to the previous tip—which is yield only—the relative positioning of the lines on the graph favor corn over grain sorghum in that the “cross point” of crop value has moved to the left, from ~20” to ~15”. This is for our educational comparison. High relative prices for corn shift this red line to the left for corn. So strictly on crop value, corn is favored more.

***But any Texas producer knows this is not the whole story! We know grain sorghum costs less to produce.***

As noted before the above graph is another singular (and not the whole story) means to compare grain sorghum vs. corn. How may this relative comparison change significantly in favor of grain sorghum even though corn yield per 1” of water and corn grain prices are higher?

So stay tuned for my next Sorghum Tip considerations:

- What effect do production costs for corn and grain sorghum have in terms of profitability in response to water use?
- How would you portray the risks of growing corn vs. grain sorghum on this type of graph?

# Economic “Loss” from Selling Low Moisture Grains Due to Excessive Harvest Delay

Producers understand the need for timely harvest to minimize potential lodging and the reduction in yield. A hidden loss of gross income, however, comes from delaying harvest well beyond when grain sorghum could be cut and sold closer to (but below) 14% moisture. How can this happen? Your pay weight is not adjusted up for low moisture, so you don't get to sell water, i.e. any moisture in the seed up to 14% adds to your pay weight.

Example: For grain sorghum the net effect of each 1% moisture content below the standard 14% reduces your effective yield. In this example at \$8.50/cwt., the reduction in pounds of grain to sell translates to a \$0.098/cwt. penalty per each -1% percent of moisture of drier grain. In this example grain at 10% moisture, the reduction in sale pounds is equivalent to receiving \$8.12/cwt. Thus for each 1% moisture below 14% in the harvested grain, every 1,000 lbs./A of grain is worth \$0.98/acre less (or \$4.90/cwt. less for a 5,000 lbs./A crop at 13% moisture; or \$19.20 less per acre for a 10% moisture grain crop). This adds up when you harvest several hundred acres! Obviously we can't get all the sorghum harvested right at or just under 14%, but let this knowledge lead to take that test cut a little sooner, ensure you have your custom harvester lined up, etc. This crop value differential is sufficient to justify paying a little more for earlier harvest if you can to avoid dry grain in addition to reduced potential lodging losses or storm damage. Harvest aids may help you also manage timely harvest by adding predictability to your harvest timing to capture and sell water as part of your grain.



# TEXAS BEEF CHECKOFF FACT SHEET

As allowed under the Texas Agriculture Code, cattle industry organizations have requested permission from the Texas Department of Agriculture to create a producer funded and managed, state-level beef checkoff program financed through a refundable assessment at each point of cattle ownership transfer in Texas.

## Management

The Texas Beef Checkoff program will be managed by a council appointed by the Texas Commissioner of Agriculture from producer nominees submitted by the Texas Beef Council. The managing council will be the Beef Promotion and Research Council of Texas.

## Assessment Use

The assessment will be used for promotion, marketing, research and educational efforts regarding beef and beef products in Texas, the U.S. and/or internationally. Decisions on how the funds will be used will be made by the Beef Promotion and Research Council of Texas.

## Assessment Amount

A refundable maximum assessment of \$1 per head of cattle will be collected at each point of ownership transfer in Texas.

## Assessment Exemption

Non-producers are exempt from paying the assessment. A person is a non-producer if: (A) the person's only share in the proceeds of a sale of cattle or beef is a sales commission, handling fee, or other service fee; or (B) the person: (i) acquired ownership of cattle to facilitate the transfer of ownership of such cattle from the seller to a third party; (ii) resold such cattle no later than ten days from the date on which the person acquired ownership; and (iii) certified, as required by procedures prescribed by the Beef Promotion and Research Council of Texas that the requirements of this provision have been satisfied.

## Assessment Commencement

If producers pass this referendum, the collection of the assessment will begin October 1, 2014.

## Checkoff Referendum

In accordance with provisions of Texas Agriculture Code and Texas Department of Agriculture (TDA) rules, TDA will conduct a referendum to allow cattle producers the opportunity to vote on establishing the Texas Beef Checkoff program.

## Voting Period

The referendum voting will begin on Monday, June 2, 2014, and continue through Friday, June 6, 2014.

## Voting Locations

Eligible producers may vote at any Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service county office during each office's normal business hours. If an eligible producer is unable to access a county office during the voting period, a mail-in ballot may be requested from the Texas Department of Agriculture between May 19 and June 2, 2014, by calling 512-463-3285.

## Voter Eligibility

Any producer, regardless of age, who has owned cattle in Texas any time between June 6, 2013, and June 6, 2014, is eligible to vote in the referendum. For purposes of this referendum, a producer may be either an individual or a legal business entity. Youth younger than 16 years of age must have a parent or guardian co-sign the ballot. A non-producer (i.e. dealer, order buyer, etc.) is not eligible to vote in the referendum.

## Voting Deadline

Votes must be cast or completed mail-in ballots postmarked by no later than end of business Friday, June 6, 2014.

## More Information

For more information about the Texas Beef Checkoff and the referendum contact Lance Williams, Texas Department of Agriculture, P.O. Box 12847, Austin, Texas, 78711 or call 512-463-3285 or visit [TexasAgriculture.gov](http://TexasAgriculture.gov).

## 2013 COUNTY PRODUCTION FIGURES IN; PCG AREA PRODUCED 2.44 MILLION UPLAND BALES

Friday, May 9, 2014

By Mary Jane Buerkle

The 2013 crop is officially in the books, statistics-wise, as the National Agricultural Statistics Service issued final 2013-crop production figures showing that High Plains growers produced about 2.44 million bales of cotton last year, a decrease from the 2.93 million 480-pound bales produced during the 2012 growing season and more than 220,000 bales less than the 2.67 million bales projected by NASS in their January 2014 report.

Planted acreage in 2013 was down again from the previous year, totaling just more than 3.76 million acres. Unfortunately, producers brought less than half of that to harvest at 1.68 million acres, which wasn't much more than the 1.54 million acres High Plains producers reported harvesting two crops ago in 2011, when the abandonment rate hit a record high at 66 percent. The abandonment rate from initial plantings in 2013 was 55 percent, and 44 percent in 2012.

According to the final county level production estimates released today by NASS, the Plains Cotton Growers 41-county service area accounted for almost 59 percent of the 4.1 million bales of upland cotton produced in Texas last season. Statewide production was down 17 percent from 2012, although statewide average yield per acre, at 646 pounds, was up 23 pounds from last year.

On a national basis, Texas growers accounted for almost 34 percent of the 12.2 million upland bales produced in the United States in 2013, maintaining their position as the No. 1 cotton producing state in the nation. Georgia was second with 2.3 million bales.

A complete rundown of 2013 crop statistics for planted and harvested acreage, yield per harvested acre and total bales produced in PCG's 41-county service area is included in the table that accompanies this article.

Floyd County barely edged Crosby County to be the top-producing county on the High Plains, with 228,900 480-pound bales of cotton and averaging 898 pounds per harvested acre. Overall yield per harvested acre on the High Plains averaged 694 pounds in 2013, up from 603 in 2011.

Joining Floyd County in the top ten cotton-producing counties in the High Plains Region (reported in 480-lb bales) were: Crosby, 228,600; Hockley, 211,600; Lubbock, 195,300; Lynn, 188,200; Hale, 176,400; Gaines, 174,200; Terry, 152,100; Lamb, 116,500; and Yoakum, 102,200.

As for yield, Hutchinson County retained their title from 2012 as the top-yielding county for 2013, producing 1,285 pounds per harvested acre.

Ranking second and third in yield per harvested acre were Moore County (1,200 pounds), and Hartley County (1,191 pounds). Castro and Parmer rounded out the top five High Plains counties.

A complete listing of the 2013 upland cotton production totals for Texas and other states is available on the NASS website (<http://www.nass.usda.gov>). Just click on the "Quick Stats" link to search for the data you want to find.

Source: National Agricultural Statistics Service • = Zero Production or production aggregated into Combined Counties

2013-crop Upland Cotton Production  
 Plains Cotton Growers, Inc. 41-County Service Area

County	Planted (Acres)	Harvested (Acres)	Yield per Harv. Acre	Production (Bales)
Andrews		•	•	•
Armstrong	•	•	•	•
Bailey	88,200	26,800	645	36,000
Borden	44,800	13,400	329	9,180
Briscoe	43,200	12,000	920	23,000
Carson	38,100	31,200	835	54,300
Castro	32,900	19,400	995	40,200
Cochran	140,100	52,300	596	64,900
Crosby	223,000	177,900	617	228,600
Dallam	•	•	•	•
Dawson	329,400	47,000	879	86,100
Deaf Smith	16,100	6,300	670	8,800
Dickens	31,000	28,600	436	26,000
Floyd	182,000	122,300	898	228,900
Gaines	314,000	123,200	679	174,200
Garza	47,500	37,000	568	43,800
Hale	194,800	96,600	877	176,400
Hansford	•	•	•	•
Hartley	3,800	2,700	1,191	6,700
Hemphill	•	•	•	•
Hockley	275,000	145,300	699	211,600
Howard	143,300	42,500	347	30,700
Hutchinson	4,300	3,100	1,285	8,300
Lamb	170,100	79,700	702	116,500
Lipscomb	•	•	•	•
Lubbock	283,500	119,200	786	195,300
Lynn	339,500	172,400	524	188,200
Martin	203,100	18,200	654	24,800
Midland	•	•	•	•
Moore	11,500	8,000	1,200	20,000
Motley	32,400	24,400	382	19,400
Ochiltree	6,900	6,300	777	10,200
Oldham	•	•	•	•
Parmer	32,000	12,400	983	25,400
Potter	•	•	•	•
Randall	•	•	•	•
Roberts	•	•	•	•
Sherman	•	•	•	•
Swisher	82,400	39,700	896	74,100
Terry	253,300	115,200	634	152,100
Yoakum	130,600	74,600	658	102,200
1-N Comb. Co.	*26,000	15,500	982	31,700
1-S Comb. Co.	*46,500	14,900	709	2,000
	3,769,300	1,688,100	694	2,439,580
		(weighted)		



## Summer Job Opportunity Summer 2014

**POSITION:** Summer Crop Field Scout

**EMPLOYER:** Texas Pest Management Association

**WORK AREA:** Hale & Swisher Counties, Texas

**EMPLOYMENT PERIOD:** May 24, 2014 – September 13, 2014. Employees returning to college or high school may discuss a 20 hour per week work schedule once classes resume in the fall.

**WAGES:** \$7.50 per hour for first year employees with rapid merit based potential for raises. Higher starting wages may be based upon experience.

**BONUS:** Field Scouts completing the full employment period will be eligible for a bonus, based upon the total hours worked during the summer at rate of \$0.50 per hour.

**TRANSPORTATION:** Employees will be required to use their own vehicle to drive to farms and fields. A daily travel allotment will be paid to field scouts that drive their vehicle. Scouts typically work in pairs, therefore will drive every other day.

**QUALIFICATIONS:** Applicants need good observation, listening, and writing skills. A working knowledge of basic mathematics is essential to estimating insect populations. Proof of drivers license and liability insurance is required. College students seeking an agricultural degree or those with some agricultural experience are preferred, but not necessarily essential.

**DUTIES:** Scouts will be responsible for inspecting field crops for pest and beneficial insects, weeds, crop status, and plant disease problems. Written reports will be made on each field scouted and distributed to participating growers. All employees will receive training on insect, weed, and plant disease identification and scouting procedures.

### **CONTACT FOR APPLICATION:**

**Blayne Reed**  
**Extension Agent – IPM, Hale & Swisher County**  
**225 Broadway, Suite 6**  
**Plainview, TX 79072**  
**Office: 806-291-5267**

**\*\*Employment by TPMA is open to all citizens without regard to race, color, sex, disability, religion, age, or national origin.\*\***



**NO ONE EVER  
INJURED THEIR  
EYESIGHT BY  
LOOKING ON THE  
BRIGHT SIDE**

---

## GARY CROSS

---

CEA-AG/NR

225 Broadway, Suite 6

Plainview, TX 79072

806.291.5267

<http://hale.agrilife.org>

[Gary.cross@ag.tamu.edu](mailto:Gary.cross@ag.tamu.edu)

### *Sorghum Tips—Calvin Trostle*

*Educational programs of the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service are open to all people without regard to race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, disability, genetic information or veteran status. The Texas A&M University System, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the County Commissioners Courts of Texas Cooperating*