PHYSICAL WEED CONTROL



Managing Weeds Through Hand Weeding, Cultivation, and Flaming

Sonja K. Birthisel, Eric R. Gallandt & Eric M. Venturini University of Maine School of Food and Agriculture

rganic farmers rely heavily on physical methods to manage weeds on their farms. We asked Maine organic farmers the question



Figure 1: 'Wordle' showing farmer responses to the question, "how do you manage weeds?"



"how do you manage weeds?" From their responses, a 'wordle' was created, which shows how often key words were mentioned by displaying frequently-mentioned words in larger print (Figure 1). This wordle highlights that hand weeding and cultivation are among the most frequenly cited weed control techniques used on Maine organic farms.

Hand Weeding

Hand weeding is a very effective means of weed control: one dutiful hand weeding pass can kill close to 100% of emerged weeds in a given field. This is true both when weeds are literally pulled by hand, and when precision (non-wheeled) hand tools are used. However, as weed pressure increases, so does the time needed to achieve this high level of control.¹ This can translate to high labor costs when weed density is high (Box 1).

Cultivation

Cultivation describes tillage-based weed control carried out by tractor, horse, or person-powered machinery. One great advantage to cultivation is that a single cultivation pass typically takes the same amount of time (and money), regardless of how many weeds are present. However, the effectiveness of cultivation is variable, and can be low. Research shows that one cultivation pass will kill a fixed percentage of weeds, regardless of initial weed density. This percentage varies based on a number of factors including type of machinery, experience of the operator, growth stage of weeds, and soil moisture,³ but is NOT dependent on starting weed density (**Box 2**).

Flaming

Flaming can kill large weeds as well as seedlings, but is more effective against broadleaf weeds. Because flaming does not require soil disturbance, it does not typically

Box 2: How does weed density affect cultivation?

Under the same conditions, a single cultivation pass will killed a fixed percentage of the weeds present, regardless of starting weed density. The diagram below illustrates this principle for a high 78% mortality rate per cultivation (which could be achieved under ideal cultivating conditions). The blue arrows represent cultivation events.



While it can be tempting to emphasize the positive - i.e. "I killed 78% of my weeds with one pass!" don't forget that, if starting weed density was high, the remaining weeds (in this case, 22%) may still constitute a serious weed problem.

stimulate a 'flush' of new weed emergence, and is therefore a useful tool in stale seedbed preparation. Some disadvantages to flaming are that specialized equiptment is required, and that the fossil fuel inputs are higher than those needed for other phycial weed control methods.

Strategies

There are three major strategies for the farmer wishing to reduce her weed pressure through physical means: cultivate more, cultivate better, or manage the weed seedbank.

1) Cultivate More

Increasing the number of cultivation events each season is a simple and effective weed management strategy. The disadvantages are that cultivation can cause crop loss, takes time, requires fossile fuel for tractor operation, and can contribute to the spread of weed seeds and rhizomes.

2) Cultivate Better

Timing and tool choice are key to better cultivation. For maximal weed mortality, cultivate in dry conditions, when weeds are in the 'white thread' growth stage (**Box 3**). Before they develop true leaves and fibrous root systems, weeds are very vulnerable to both dessication and burial, and therefore easily killed by cultivation.

Tool choice also affects weed management success.⁴ Using the right cultivation equiptment for your crop and soil, flaming when appropriate (especially to combat broadleaf weeds), and adjusting equiptment and tractor speed appropriately can all contritribute to highly effective organic weed management (**Box 4**).

Finally, understanding the biology of especially

Box 3: Get 'em while they're white threads

The graph at right shows how cultivation becomes less effective as weeds grow in size.

Weeds are most vulnerable when they are in the 'white thread' growth stage, pictured below on the right side of the penny. Once true leaves start to form, as pictured on the penny's left, the root system has already developed enough to hold onto soil when it is unearthed, making it much more resilient against disturbance, and harder to kill.





The proportion of weeds killed with each cultivation pass decreases as weeds grow.

Box 4: Weed control machines

Farmers throughout the ages have invented and adapted weed control machines to suit their needs. Some examples of New England ingenuity are highlighed in the film Vegetable Farmers and their Weed Control Machines² put out by UVM Cooperative Extension. In recent years, researchers and farmers in Europe have developed numerous novel weed control machines, including the examples highlighted here.





This robotic flame-weeder is mounted with a camera that distinguishes between weeds and crop plants, allowing it to automatically toast inter-row weeds.



The 'Weedmaster,' pictured here with finger weeder attachments, is a versatile person-powed cultivator that can also be equipped with disk hillers, sweeps, and flaming equiptment.

problematic weeds (**Figure 2**) can help you plan crop rotations so that tillage or cultivation coincides with emergence, or preempts seed rain, of weeds you especially wish to control.

3) Reduce Your Weed Pressure

Other weed management strategies aimed at depleting the weed seedbank can simplify weed management long-term by reducing the starting weed density (**Box 2**), and therefore the time and effort needed to manage weeds in subsequent growing seasons.⁵ Check out to the Seedbank Management Bulletin in this series to learn more.



Literature Cited:

- 1. Bond, W. & Turner, R.J. (2005). A review of mechanical weed control. HDRA, Coventry, UK.
- Vegetable Farmers and their Weed Control Machines 2005 (video recording), Burlington, VT, Grubiger, V. & Else, M.J.
- 3. van der Schans, D. *et al.* (2006). Practical weed control in arable farming and outdoor vegetable cultivation without chemicals. Wageningen UR, Wageningen, the Netherlands.
- 4. van der Weide, R.Y. *et al.* (2008). Innovation in mechanical weed control in crop rows. Weed Research 48: 215-224.
- Melander, B., Rasmussen, I.A., & Barberi, P. (2005). Sypmosium: Integrating physical and cultural methods of weed control examples from European research. Weed Science 53: 369-381.

Emergence of Common Weeds



Figure 2: Graphs of weed seedling emergence on Maine farms over one growing season.

Information in this publication is provided purely for educational purposes. No responsibility is assumed for any problems associated with the use of products or services mentioned. No endorsement of products or companies is intended, nor is criticism of unnamed products or companies implied.

© 2014

Published and distributed in furtherance of Cooperative Extension work, Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914, by the University of Maine and the U.S. Department of Agriculture cooperating. Cooperative Extension and other agencies of the USDA provide equal opportunities in programs and employment. Call 800.287.0274 or TDD 800.287.8957 (in Maine), or 207.581.3188, for information on publications and program offerings from University of Maine Cooperative Extension, or visit extension.umaine.edu.

The University of Maine does not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, including transgender status and gender expression, national origin, citizenship status, age, disability, genetic information or veteran's status in employment, education, and all other programs and activities. The following person has been designated to handle inquiries regarding non-discrimination policies: Director, Office of Equal Opportunity, 101 North Stevens Hall, 207.581.1226.

Funding provided by the National Institute of Food and Agriculture Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative, Award No. 2009-51300-05653, "Mental Models and Participatory Research to Redesign Extension."