Project No. RM-

**ANNUAL REPORT**
**COMPREHENSIVE RESEARCH ON RICE**
**January 1, 2012-December 31, 2012**

PROJECT TITLE: Identifying opportunities for improving water use efficiency in California rice systems.

PROJECT LEADERS:

Bruce Linquist
Professional Researcher
University of California
One Shields Avenue
Department of Plant Sciences
Davis, California 95616-8627
(530) 752-3450
balinquist@ucdavis.edu

Robert Hijmans
Assistant Professor
Environmental Science and Policy

Richard Snyder
UCCE Specialist-Biometeorology
Land, Air and Water Resources

Richard Plant
Professor
Plant Sciences

Chris van Kessel, Professor
Department Chair
Plant Sciences

Jim Hill,
UCCE Specialist-Rice
Plant Sciences

COOPERATORS: Randall Mutters, UCCE Farm Advisor
Butte County

Chris Greer, UCCE Farm Advisor
Sutter, Placer and Yuba Counties

Luis Espino, UCCE Farm Advisor
Colusa, Glenn and Yolo Counties

AMOUNT REQUESTED: $48,701

**CONCISE GENERAL SUMMARY OF CURRENT YEAR'S RESULTS:**

1. Field and greenhouse studies evaluating 9 CA varieties (M104, M105, M202, M205, M206, L206, S102, CM101, and M401) indicated that regardless of planting date all varieties had similar times to PI. Varietal differences, with respect to duration, primarily occurred between PI and heading and to a lesser extent between heading and maturity.
2. A greenhouse study, with temperature controlled, was conducted with the above mentioned varieties and planted a 6 different times between April 3 and June 12 with the objective of determining if the varieties were photoperiod sensitive. Using a degree day (DD) model to account for small differences in temperature between the different planting times we identified three groups of varieties: photoperiod sensitive (M401), moderately photoperiod sensitive (CM101, M104, M105, M202, M205, M206) and photoperiod non-sensitive varieties (S102 and L206).
3. For the photoperiod non-sensitive varieties (S102 and L206), the main driver in terms of crop development is temperature. We developed a degree day model for these two varieties and were able to accurately predict time to 50% heading. These results are very encouraging as in previous years we had been trying to run these models using M202 and M206 with limited success. Our greenhouse studies indicate the reason that a pure DD model does not work for M202 and M206 is that time to heading in these varieties is also driven by photoperiod. Based on the greenhouse data, we can now (with confidence) develop a crop development model that accounts for both temperature and photoperiod - a primary research objective for 2013.

**BACKGROUND**

Abbreviated background

The background section is long and similar to the background provided for this report in previous years. In brief, the main point we are making is that initially this project started out trying to identify options for conserving water in CA rice systems. We looked at drill vs. wet seeding, effect of different planting dates, and varieties of different duration. While gains are possible through some of these practices – they are small (roughly 1-2 inch). In doing this research, we found that it was not possible to predict with accuracy crop duration (based on degree day calculations) and hence the amount of time a field is irrigated. On problem is that all information on the duration of CA varieties is limited to "days to heading"; however varieties also differ in their time from heading to maturity. When considering water use and other management practices we also need to know days to other critical stages such as panicle initiation (PI) or maturity. Little to no information exists on this. When we attempted to predict days to heading using degree day (DD) models, the predictions were poor. One reason for this is that some varieties may be moderately photoperiod sensitive. This research has then shifted focus (for the time being) to developing a good predictive crop development model that can predict days to PI, heading and maturity based on planting date. The model will account for both temperature and photoperiod sensitivity. We anticipate that this model will be valuable in aiding growers plan their management decisions and in addressing the original issue related to water use.

Full background

Water is scarce in California and there are efforts to conserve water in all sectors of the economy. Identifying opportunities to conserve water and increase water use efficiency (WUE) will be increasingly important for the rice industry as well.

To discuss options for improving rice WUE, identifying where water losses are occurring is essential. In brief, water is lost through **evaporation** (E - water vapor loss from water surfaces), **transpiration** (T - water vapor loss from plant surfaces), **percolation and seepage** (water loss downward through the soil) and **drainage** (D - surface water loss from drain outlet). Evaporation and transpiration are often combined and referred to as **evapotranspiration** (ET). In California, total annual (growing season) water use in rice systems is estimated at between 3.6 and 7.7 ac ft/ac (Table 1). Of this amount, 3.1 to 3.7 ac ft/ac go to ET, 0.5 to 2.0 ac ft are lost via percolation, and 0 to 2.0 ac ft are drained from the field. Separating losses due to E and T indicate that both E and T losses are significant and roughly equal in magnitude.

Identifying potential improvements in terms of WUE and crop productivity are important issues that will address the current efficiency of WUE in the rice industry as well as address various options for reducing water use. We will briefly consider each loss and the possibilities for reducing those losses and how a reduction in those losses may affect rice system sustainability.

Transpiration is the amount of water lost as water vapor as the crop takes up water through its roots and the water exits the plant through stomata in the stems and leaves. A plant must take up water to survive as water is used in the transport of nutrients, in photosynthesis, to provide cell rigor, to cool the plant, etc. The amount of water required to produce a certain amount of biomass, i.e. the transpiration efficiency (TE), is relatively constant for each crop. For rice the TE is lower than other C3 cereal grains. Rice produces 1.47 g biomass/kg water compared to the other C3 cereal crops which average 1.84 g biomass/kg water (25% more). Alfalfa (1.33 g biomass/kg water) is one of the major crops in California, and rice has a higher TE. While TE varies considerably between crops it does not vary much between varieties of the same crop. For example, extensive breeding efforts over the last century have not changed the TE of maize. What has changed in maize (and in other grains) is the partitioning efficiency of maize so that more of the biomass is grain (Loomis and Conner, 1992). Thus, it is not likely in the near term that research efforts will be able to change the TE of rice.

Evaporation (E), or the water loss from water surfaces, is a significant form of water loss from fields. During the early part of the growing season in California's wet-seeded systems, most of the water lost from the systems occurs via E because the plants are small and T is minimal. As the season progress, T contributes increasingly to water loss as the canopy develops which increases transpiration and reduces E by shading the surface of the water. Evaporation losses can be reduced by reducing the amount of water exposed to sunlight and surface air. This is part of the rationale behind dry seeding. In dry-seeded rice systems, water is flushed across the field but standing water is not maintained. This practice may reduce E losses during the first month before a flooded paddy is maintained.

Percolation and seepage losses vary tremendously between fields and even within a field. Such losses are very difficult to quantify and are usually estimated based on the difference between total water loss and losses due to ET and D. Generally, in California, due to the high clay content and hardpan soils where rice is cultivated, percolation losses are low. However percolation losses can be high in newly developed rice fields where hardpans are broken or when sand streaks are present within a field.  Management of percolation losses is impractical because it is often difficult to determine where the losses are occurring within the field. Seepage losses are more easily identified and controlled but they are generally a minor component of the water balance.

Drainage losses also vary tremendously and range from 0 to 2.0 ac ft (and higher). Drainage events are common in rice fields either as a complete drain or to as part of maintenance flow operations (continual flow of water through a field). Growers prefer to have the option to drain water as part of their herbicide management programs and to control water height in the field. Furthermore, some soils are saline and require maintenance flow of fresh water to avoid salinity problems which may reduce rice yields. However, we have observed that a number of growers do not drain water from their fields and have maintained good rice yields. This suggests that at least in some fields, farms or districts no water outflow may be an option to reduce D.

Finally, it is important to consider the losses not only at a field scale but also a regional scale. Water lost from a field due to percolation, seepage and D eventually ends up in the Sacramento River either via surface drain water canals or underground lateral movement of water. In contrast, water lost via ET is lost from the system at both field and regional scales.

**Some proposed options for reducing water use**

Table 3 provides some options to reduce water use in rice. The table identifies where these savings might be realized as well as some possible counter effects. These options are discussed in more detail below.

***Table 1.*** *A summary of various management options and our assumptions on if they reduce evaporation (E), transpiration (T) and drainage (D).*

| | Reduce | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Management option | E | T | D | Comment |
| Use shorter duration varieties | Y | Y | Y | Shorter duration varieties may yield less |
| Reduce crop duration by planting later in season when it is warmer | Y | Y | Y | May not be an option for large growers. planting too late may reduce yield. |
| Drill seeded rice | Y | N | ? | Dry seeded rice extends crop duration by 7-10 days so savings in E may be lost in T and D |
| Aerobic rice (not flooded but irrigated like wheat) | Y | N | Y | Aerobic rice extends crop duration by up to 2 wk based on observations in 2009. Increased risk of water stress. |
| Early final drain | N | ? | Y | Thompson and Mutters have show that there may be potential to drain rice fields a few days to a week earlier than normal. |
| No outlet flow | N | N | Y | In some fields, salinity may be an issue |

*Options for reducing ET (net water use)*

1. Reduce crop duration by growing shorter duration varieties: Shorter duration require less water because the crop grows for a shorter period of time thus lowering transpiration (T) and evaporation (E) if the initial growth period is shortened. As mentioned earlier, shorter

duration varieties typically have lower yields than longer maturing varieties due to a reduction in photosynthesis.

2. Reduce crop duration by planting later in the season: Planting later ensures planting in warmer weather (and water) which accelerates canopy closure thus reducing E during the early part of the season. Since planting occurs during the warmer part of the season, degree days will accumulate faster and the initial growth is more rapid. Since water is a better absorber of sunlight, the faster canopy growth reduces net radiation and, hence, the energy available to evaporate water. Thus, faster growth reduces the rice ET relative to ETo. This is the opposite of other field crops which tend to having increasing ET relative to ETo as the crop grows. Later planting dates, however, may be an option only for growers with relatively low acreage.
3. Dry seeded rice systems: Possibly requires less water early in the growing season by reducing E, however, drill seeding extends the duration of the crop. Gains made in savings to E may be lost by having to irrigate the crop longer. We estimate that dry seeding extends crop duration by 7 to 10 days. Analysis of three years of data comparing the two systems shows that ET is similar for both systems (Table 2).
4. Aerobic rice production: Aerobic rice production would involve irrigating the crop like wheat. There would be savings to E during early crop establishment until canopy coverage. Savings due to reduced E will also depend on the type of irrigation (flood versus sprinkler). However, like dry-seeded rice, irrigating the crop in this manner extends crop duration. In a 2009 trial at the Rice Experiment Station (RES) aerobic rice systems headed two weeks later than conventional water-seeded systems. Thus, savings to E may be lost by needing to irrigate longer. Additionally, the risk of water stress is increased due to the possibility of untimely irrigations.

***Table 2.*** *Net water use (water applied – drainage water), ET and percolation/seepage (net water use – ET) for wet and dry seeded rice systems across three years. In each study year, the wet and dry seeded fields were adjacent to each other.*

| **Year** | **Wet seeded** | | | **Dry seeded** | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Net water use | ET | Percolation / seepage | Net water use | ET | Percolation/ seepage |
| | Acre feet/acre | | | | | |
| 2007 | 3.04 | 2.95 | 0.09 | 3.96 | 2.97 | 0.99 |
| 2008 | 3.47 | 3.0 | 0.47 | 4.12 | 2.78 | 1.34 |
| 2009 | 4.37 | 2.8 | 1.57 | 2.63 | 2.8 | 0 |
| **Mean** | **3.63** | **2.92** | **0.71** | **3.57** | **2.85** | **0.78** |

*Options for reducing drainage (D) and gross water use:*

1. Reduce tailwater drainage: Some growers and irrigation districts have had success in either reducing or eliminating tailwater outflow. This does not directly affect ET but it reduces D and hence the amount of water delivered to a field. The main problem is with salinity in some fields (see Scardaci et al., 2002).
2. Early final drain: Thompson and Mutters in recent research funded by the Rice Research Board (RRB) have suggested that, with the use of certain varieties, there is the possibility of draining the fields by up to a week earlier. This would require a week less of delivery to a field and reduce D.

**PROGRESS TO DATE (THROUGH 2011)**

1. We summarized 3 years of data on water use in wet and dry seeded systems. Preliminary results show that seasonal evapo-transpiration and water use are similar for the two systems.
2. A data base has largely been developed from statewide wide variety trails that contain information on all major varieties, yields, planting dates and days to heading. Data on all varieties is available for 1994 to 2009 and for the major varieties from 1978 to 2009.
3. A crop development model was developed for M-202 based on the growing degree day concept. This model, while an improvement on simply counting days to heading, could be improved by accounting for accounting for photoperiod sensitivity.
4. Using the preliminary degree day model, we tested two options that could potentially reduce ET in rice systems. These were to (1) reduce crop duration by planting later in the season when it is warmer and (2) reduce crop duration by planting a shorter duration variety (M-206 versus M-202). For both M-202 and M-206 a later planting date would reduce ET by about 1 inch between planting to heading. The days to 50% heading for M-206 were 6 and 8 days less than for M-202 for planting dates of May 1 and June 1, respectively. Shorter duration translated into reduced ET by 1.6 inches (about an 8% reduction) between planting and heading. This difference comes without a reduction in yield as yields of M-206 are comparable to M-202. However, this data needs to be interpreted with caution for a couple of reasons. First, the model is still in its development stages and we know it needs improvement. Second, we do not know how varieties differ between heading and maturity. For example, does a 6 to 8 day difference in time to heading also translate into a 6 to 8 day difference in time to maturity?
5. Work has begun to develop a crop development prediction model. In 2011, we collected two additional growth stages of importance: panicle initiation (green ring) and time to physiological maturity (grain at 28% moisture). These data were collected for 8 varieties common to California (M104, M105, M202, M205, M206, L206, CM101, S102). Within any given location, the time from planting to PI was similar for the 8 varieties we evaluated in 2011. The main difference between varieties (that affected crop duration) was between PI and 50% heading. The time from 50% heading to physiological maturity was similar for the 8 varieties we evaluated in 2011 except for the long grain variety tested (L206) which had a shorter time from heading to maturity than the other varieties possibly due to the narrow grain drying out faster. Data collected from these field trials suggest that at least some of these varieties are partially photoperiod sensitive.

**OBJECTIVES FOR 2012**

As the previous discussion indicates, reducing water use in rice systems is not straight forward and involves complex interactions which are costly and time consuming to test in the field. A more cost effective way is to narrow the possible options using existing data and crop simulation models. This would determine which of the many options are most likely to yield positive results in field trails. With this in mind, our overall objective of this project is to identify options for improving WUE for California rice systems while maintaining productivity and soil quality. Importantly we want to maximize our productivity for every unit of water used (more crop per drop). While we have examined some options (described earlier) our primary objective now is to develop a model that accurately predicts various stages of crop development (PI, heading and maturity) based on temperature and the degree a variety is photoperiod sensitive. Building on previous years efforts, our specific objectives for 2012 were:

1. Continue monitoring 8 varieties common to California (M104, M105, M202, M205, M206, L206, CM101, S102) to determine time to PI, heading and maturity in each of the statewide variety trials.
2. Determine degree of photoperiod sensitivity for these same varieties in a controlled temperature greenhouse setting with multiple planting dates.
3. Based on data obtained from Objectives 1 and 2, develop a model that is able to predict the timing of PI, heading and maturity.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE AND RESULTS TO ACCOMPLISH OBJECTIVES:**

Objective 1: In 2012, 8 varieties common to California (M104, M105, M202, M205, M206, L206, CM101, S102) were selected for observation. Each of these varieties were planted in separate plots outside each of the statewide rice variety trails. Throughout the season plots were regularly visited and stages of growth determined. We determined green ring (PI), heading (50%) and maturity (R7-Counce et al., 2000).

Objective 2: The controlled temperature environment of the greenhouse was used to quantify the effect of photoperiod on rice growth and development. Nine major California rice varieties were evaluated in this study (M104, M105, M202, M205, M206, L206, S102, CM101, and M401). All varieties were planted at two-week intervals in pots from the beginning of April to mid-June. Two pots (standard #5 regular nursery pots) per variety were planted at each planting date and submerged in in 20 $^{x}$ 3 $^{x}$ 1 ft basins filled with water such that the height of water was 2'' over the tops of the pots. All varieties were randomly assigned to the pots in each basin and planting dates were randomized between basins. Crop growth stages were closely monitored and recorded for all varieties and planting dates. While temperature effects were minimized across planting dates, the air and water temperatures were recorded throughout the experiment in order to account for any temperature variation. Panicle initiation, flowering, and physiological maturity were identified as follows: Panicle initiation was tested using four random destructive samples per sampling; when 2 or more of the 4 sampled plants show panicle initiation (internodes elongation between node 5-6 and green ring formation), the crop was designated as having reached 50% panicle initiation. 50% flowering of each plot is determined by visual observation. To test for physiological maturity, grain color was used as described by Counce et al. 2000.

When at least one grain on the main stem panicle has a yellow hull, the crop was said to have reached physiological maturity.

Objective 3: These data are being used to develop a crop development model. While work has begun in this area it is very preliminary.

**RESULTS**

Objective 1:
In 2012 planting dates for the statewide variety trails ranged from May 8 (Glenn county) to May 29 (Colusa county) (Table 1). As we have found in previous years the time to PI for all varieties is relatively similar (average of 52 days). This holds true even for M401 – considered a late maturing photoperiod sensitive variety. The real difference between varieties is the time between PI and heading and to a lesser extent between heading and maturity.

These data, along with those from 2011 (and hopefully 2013), are being compiled into a date base which will be used to develop a crop development model for each of these varieties.

Objective 2:
Rice varieties were planted in the greenhouse at six different dates from April 3 to June 12 in order to access how sensitive they are to photoperiod. Average daily temperatures were warmer in the greenhouse so the plants developed faster than would normally be observed in the field. Days to PI was very similar for all varieties and planting dates and averaged 44 days. As we noted in the field trial, the real difference among varieties occurred between PI and heading.

Using a degree day (DD) model to account for differences in temperature between the different planting times we identified three groupings of varieties (Fig. 1): photoperiod sensitive (M401), moderately photoperiod sensitive (CM101,M104, M105, M202, M205, M206) and photoperiod non-sensitive varieties (S102 and L206). In these graphs 11 DD is about 1 day. For example, the photoperiod non-sensitive varieties all required the same amount of DD to reach heading regardless of planting time. For all the other varieties the number of DD required to reach PI was high for late April/early May planting dates and then decreased. In the moderately sensitive varieties (with the exception of M105), late planting (in June) also resulted in a longer period from planting to PI. For these varieties the shortest time from planting to PI would be for mid-May plantings.

Objective 3:
Results from the greenhouse study suggest that varieties differ in their response to photoperiod. This explains why in previous years when we tried to develop a DD model for M202 and M206 our results were not very good. That is because they are affected by both DD and photoperiod. Fortunately our experiment identified two varieties which are not photoperiod sensitive (S102 and L206). We can use these varieties to accurately determine the effect of temperature on development. For these two varieties we collected historical data (days to heading) from statewide wide variety trials. This included data from different years, locations and planting dates. We used a DD model similar to that developed in previous years by which only temperature (degree day accumulation) determines the rate of crop development.

In Figure 2 we show results of how a DD model predicts days to heading for S102 and L206. We also show this for M202. In such figures you want your slope to be close to 1.0 as this means that there is a 1:1 relationship between predicted and observed values. Furthermore you want the R2 to be as high as possible (the higher the number the less variability in results-max number is 1). The data for M202 is relatively poor (as discussed earlier). The slope of the relationship between observed and predicted is 0.48 and the R2 is 0.16. This poor relationship is because M202 is also photoperiod sensitive. In contrast, for S102 and L206 the slope of the line is 1.07 and 1.02, respectively and the R2 values are 0.58 and 0.71, respectively. This model predicted fairly accurately time to flowering for photo-period non-sensitive varieties.

**Future Research**

2012 research results are very encouraging in that we were able to quantitatively determine how photoperiod sensitive a variety is. We were able to develop a model that predicts relatively accurately days to heading in non-sensitive varieties. Our future work will be to expand the model to include photoperiod. This is important as the main CA varieties are all moderately sensitive to photoperiod. Our goal will be to develop an on-line application that will allow growers to determine the stage of crop development based on planting date and variety.

*Table 1. Dates for various growth stages for different varieties used in 2012.*

| Variety | Grower | Variety trial | Plt date | DAS at 50% PI | Days at 50% Heading | R7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CM101 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 56 | 84 | 105 |
| CM101 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 79 | 98 |
| CM101 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 50 | 80 | 93 |
| CM101 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 76 | 98 |
| CM101 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 85 | 106 |
| CM101 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 49 | 80 | 99 |
| CM101 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 82 | 102 |
| CM101 | RES | Early | 22-May | 49 | NA | 99 |
| L206 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 58 | 97 | 112 |
| L206 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 83 | 98 |
| L206 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 53 | 86 | 93 |
| L206 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 80 | 96 |
| L206 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 84 | 100 |
| L206 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 49 | 80 | 99 |
| L206 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 81 | 102 |
| L206 | RES | Early | 22-May | 50 | NA | 101 |
| M104 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 56 | 84 | 105 |
| M104 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 81 | 98 |
| M104 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 50 | 80 | 93 |
| M104 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 80 | 102 |
| M104 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 83 | 104 |
| M104 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 49 | 76 | 99 |
| M104 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 80 | 103 |
| M104 | RES | Early | 22-May | 50 | NA | 99 |
| M202 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 58 | 90 | 108 |
| M202 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 86 | 104 |
| M202 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 52 | 86 | 115 |
| M202 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 90 | 108 |
| M202 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 89 | 110 |
| M202 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 53 | 84 | 105 |
| M202 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 88 | 112 |
| M202 | RES | Early | 22-May | 51 | NA | 107 |
| M205 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 56 | 92 | 114 |
| M205 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 90 | 108 |
| M205 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 52 | 90 | 105 |
| M205 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 95 | 114 |
| M205 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 96 | 116 |
| M205 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 53 | 86 | 112 |
| M205 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 89 | 117 |
| M205 | RES | Early | 22-May | 51 | NA | 109 |
| M206 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 56 | 92 | 108 |
| M206 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 86 | 98 |
| M206 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 53 | 86 | 105 |
| M206 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 48 | 86 | 104 |
| M206 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 87 | 106 |
| M206 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 51 | 80 | 103 |
| M206 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 83 | 105 |
| M206 | RES | Early | 22-May | 51 | NA | 104 |
| M401 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 58 | 110 | 131 |
| M401 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 53 | 100 | 121 |
| M401 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 53 | 111 | 128 |
| M401 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 54 | 99 | 126 |
| M401 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 110 | 132 |
| M401 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 57 | 98 | 126 |
| M401 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 60 | 97 | 125 |
| M401 | RES 1 | Early | 22-May | 54 | NA | 120 |
| S102 | Yolo | Very Early | 14-May | 56 | 83 | 105 |
| S102 | Sutter/Lauppe Ranch | Very Early | 24-May | 49 | 78 | 98 |
| S102 | Sutter/Scott Tucker | Int late | 17-May | 50 | 79 | 93 |
| S102 | Colusa/Canal Ranch | Early | 29-May | 50 | 75 | 98 |
| S102 | Yuba | Early | 22-May | 49 | 82 | 106 |
| S102 | Butte | Early | 28-May | 49 | 76 | 101 |
| S102 | Glenn/Wylie Ranch | Int late | 8-May | 54 | 81 | 102 |
| S102 | RES | Early | 22-May | 49 | NA | 101 |

*Table 2. 2012 greenhouse study results*

| Variety | Planting Date | Days to PI | Days to 50% heading | R7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **CM 101** | 4/3/2012 | 45 | 70 | 90 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 76 | 97 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 48 | 73 | 94 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 69 | 92 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 78 | 94 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 69 | 85 |
| **S 102** | 4/3/2012 | 43 | 69 | 90 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 73 | 92 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 44 | 71 | 90 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 71 | 92 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 70 | 91 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 69 | 87 |
| **M104** | 4/3/2012 | 43 | 76 | 90 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 73 | 90 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 48 | 73 | 92 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 66 | 84 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 70 | 87 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 66 | 80 |
| **M105** | 4/3/2012 | 45 | 76 | 91 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 76 | 90 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 44 | 71 | 92 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 71 | 92 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 73 | 87 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 64 | 85 |
| **M202** | 4/3/2012 | 43 | 83 | 98 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 83 | 104 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 44 | 76 | 94 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 73 | 92 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 78 | 94 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 71 | 91 |
| **M205** | 4/3/2012 | 45 | 78 | 97 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 83 | 104 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 48 | 78 | 101 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 76 | 92 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 78 | 94 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 71 | 91 |
| **M206** | 4/3/2012 | 43 | 72 | 90 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 73 | 94 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 48 | 76 | 98 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 69 | 87 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 45 | 70 | 91 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 69 | 85 |
| **M401** | 4/3/2012 | 45 | 85 | 106 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 50 | 104 | 122 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 50 | 108 | 125 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 45 | 94 | 113 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 48 | 94 | 115 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 43 | 80 | 101 |
| **L206** | 4/3/2012 | 45 | 76 | 91 |
| | 4/17/2012 | 48 | 71 | 90 |
| | 5/1/2012 | 44 | 71 | 87 |
| | 5/15/2012 | 41 | 71 | 87 |
| | 5/29/2012 | 43 | 73 | 85 |
| | 6/12/2012 | 41 | 66 | 80 |




*Figure 1. Relationship between planting date and degree days (DD) to heading. Varieties that are not sensitive to photoperiod (non-sensitive) should require a similar amount of DD to reach heading regardless of planting date as we see with S102 and L206.*




*Figure 2. Predicted model output versus observed for days to heading comparing L206 and S102 with M202.*