

Best In Furrow Fertilizer for No-Till?

[kevin wcmo](#)

Posted 9/16/2006 15:38 (#44261)

Subject: ? for bill moyer and others

[Quote](#) [Reply](#) [Alert](#)



what have you found to be the best mix of liquid fertilizer for an in-furrow application in a no-till situation. thanks

kevin

[Bill Moyer](#)

Posted 9/16/2006 21:33 (#44327 - in reply to #44261)

Subject: RE: ? for bill moyer and others

[Quote](#) [Reply](#) [Alert](#) [Edit](#) [Delete](#)

Coldwater, Michigan

Kevin,

What are you no-tilling? Wheat, corn, beans? What? When are you planting it(early, mid, etc)? What kind of soils? Ph levels? And last at this time, what maturity for your area are you planting?

Don't really care what you soil tests are from a standpoint of making the choice of product. You should care from an overall fertility standpoint, but that won't influence which "in-furrow" product performs the best.

There's a lot of "smoke and Mirrors" out there, but that's all a lot of it is. In my starter fertilizer trials 70-75% of the in-furrow products aren't any better than the check(no-starter). Of course, 10-34-0 at 15 gallons 2"x2" doesn't beat the check more than about 53% of the time. And with 10-34-0 in-furrow it beats the check even less of the time, but it is cheaper than putting 15 gallons beside the row.

Some of the better in-furrow products will beat the check as much as 87% of the time. Then you have to apply economics to the equation. With \$2.00 avearge corn for the past 15 years, and varying prices for the in-furrow, depending on who is selling it; that gets rid of some of the better ones.

I'm here to tell you, with the above qualifications, there are only a few left to recommend.

Bill Moyer, Dir
LFB Solutions, Inc

[kevin wcmo](#)

Posted 9/16/2006 22:02 (#44331 - in reply to #44327)
Subject: RE: ? for bill moyer and others

[Quote](#) [Reply](#) [Alert](#)



sorry about that. it is corn. i plant mainly varieties in the 108-115 range. some 90's are starting to work good in the area because it beats the heat. soil type varies a lot around here. mainly a clay loam would be the best description. a heavier type of soil, not any sand at all. can't rule out some rocky areas either :<(. earlier planted the better 98% of the time. like to get started around the last of march to the first of april, weather permitting. good rule of thumb for around here is to have the corn tasseling by the fourth of july. ph levels are in the low 6's to 7. thanks

kevin

Message format

Threaded

[New Post](#)

[Forums List](#) -> [Crop Talk](#)

Posted 9/18/2006 10:56 (#44684 - in reply to #44331)
Subject: RE: ? for bill moyer and others

[Quote](#) [Reply](#) [Alert](#) [Edit](#) [Delete](#)

Well Kevin,

I should state before I get started, the following discussion concerns corn only.

Equipment used for the application can make or break you, in this venture. See picture below. The equipment traveled left to right (crossways) in this picture. It was in a wheat drill setup by a competitor. My dealer was called out to trouble shoot the issue here.

I hate to make a total blanket recommendation. However, some general observations. Hope I don't get crucified

for this: With your heavier soils, the in-furrow such as 9-18-9 or 8-19-3 are not as dangerous as they would be on lighter soils. These products contain Urea which is very hot at the point of contact for a period of time. Urea drives the soil pH to an extreme at the time it meets moisture at the point of contact. Sort of like NH_3 in this respect. It has been such an issue that organizations such as Purdue University even had an article about "Urea Hydrolysis" on their website a couple of years ago. Their article concerned using Urea generally. If you were to use it in direct contact with the seed you can understand under the correct conditions how it could become a problem.

Many companies have used these products successfully. That's one of the reasons they often recommend only 3 gallons on-seed. The story goes: 3 gallons is all you'll need! In actuality, 3 gallons in sandy soil is all they are willing to guarantee the safety of in contact with the seed. With my former company, I'm convinced that the reason their 6-24-6 product almost always beat their 9-18-9 product in replicated yield trials was an issue of safety.

It has been my observation in my plots that if you are using a safer product, you can often raise the rate considerably without causing damage. Some of my plots have had as much as 20 gallons per acre in-furrow. Some of the less safe products have at that point "fried" the corn germination and at that point even some of the safer ones are causing damage.

Here is another "heresy": I believe safety is the issue where some of you guys have gotten away with 10-34-0 on the seed. Most seed-placed "premium" companies have declared "salt" to be the issue of seed safety. It is, but nitrogen form can make as much difference as the salt content.

For years we have been told: 10-34-0 has lots of salt, therefore it isn't safe on the seed. They are correct: 10-34-0 has lots of salt. But in the fertilizer trials I have run for 15 years, it appears to be safer than a lot of the products with significant amounts of Urea.

Just because 10-34-0 appears to be safer than the high Urea products, however, doesn't mean it is as safe as it should be to be a good seed-placed product. That's why you never stop testing.

It appears as though a high quality 6-24-6 (there are some that aren't) is safer yet than 10-34-0. There are even fewer of them that will beat 10-34-0 consistently in the yield department. There is a tremendous difference in performance of 6-24-6 products.

The company I used to represent had a 6-24-6 product that consistently over a 8 year period, in multiple trials per year, beat a large competitor's 6-24-6 product by an average of 4.1 BPA. The customer's cost was similar. My own LFB Solutions 6-24-6 product beat the former employer's 6-24-6 product at a major University last year in 40 trials by an average of 3.4 BPA. Customer cost: the same!

Put some numbers on that! There is a tremendous difference in return per acre, depending on who your supplier is. That from an industry that has spent the better part of 70 years saying "a pound of 'P' is a pound of 'P' no matter how you 'PEE' it. That doesn't consider there may be something else in the mix. The fertilizer industry has taken the attitude that 6-24-6 is 6-24-6, it doesn't matter who makes it.

All I ask you to do is put a pencil to it and be careful.

Edited by Bill Moyer 9/18/2006 11:10



(Squeeze pump -best.JPG)

Attachments

- [Squeeze pump -best.JPG](#) (68KB - 1 downloads)

Bill Moyer, Dir LFB Solutions, Inc

