Risk and the Value of Additional Insecticide Applications for European Corn Borer Control in Processing Sweet Corn

> Paul D. Mitchell William D. Hutchison Terrance M. Hurley

Midwest Food Processors Association Annual Meeting, St. Paul, MN Dec. 6-7, 2005

### **Overview of Presentation**

Goal: use insecticide field trial data to estimate the value and risk effect of an additional insecticide application for ECB control in processing sweet corn

Work in progress as part of NC IPM grant
Preliminary empirical results today



Efficacy data from pyrethroid trials (~ 50) Capture, Warrior, Baythroid, Mustang, Pounce Most data from: MN, WI, IN and AMT Data include: Mean ECB larvae/ear for treated and untreated control plots % yield marketable for processing Number of sprays and application rate

## **Empirical Model**

Keep key variables random to capture the risk/uncertainty in pest control Develop hierarchical model of linked conditional probability densities Estimate non-normal conditional densities Mean and variance depend on other variables that may be random



### Apply Insecticide

### Random Remaining ECB

### Random % Marketable for Processing

### Random Pest-Free Yield

#### Net Returns

Net Returns =  $P_{sc} \times Yld \times MktProc - P_i \times AI_i - #Sprys \times CostApp - COP$ 

# Initial/Untreated ECB density

Lognormal density with constant mean and standard deviation ■ WI DATCP fall surveys of 2<sup>nd</sup> generation ECB larvae in field corn (1964-2004) Mean 0.70 Standard Deviation 0.92 **CV 130%** 

# Remaining/Treated ECB density

- Lognormal density
- Mean and standard deviation functions of initial ECB and amount of applied AI, with insecticide specific effects
- More initial ECB, on average more treated ECB
  More AI applied, on average fewer treated ECB
  Insecticide Specific Effects: at max approved rate, efficacy ranking (best to worst) is: Capture/Warrior-Baythroid, Mustang, Pounce

## % Marketable for Processing

Beta density between 0 and 1
Mean function of the ECB larval population density (exponential decrease)
More ECB, on average lower percentage marketable for processing
Constant variance/standard deviation

## Pest-Free Yield

Harvested yield without ECB damage
Beta density (common for crop yields)
Mean: 6.6 tons/ac (WI NASS 3-yr avg.)
CV: 25% (increase WI NASS state CV)
Minimum: 0 tons/ac
Maximum: 9.9 tons/ac (mean + 2 st. dev.)

Prices and Costs Sweet Corn: \$67.60/ton Insecticides (\$/ac-treatment) Capture Warrior Baythroid \$6.09/ac \$2.82/ac \$3.49/ac Mustang Pounce \$2.80/ac \$3.76/ac Aerial Application: \$4.85/ac-treatment Other Costs of Production: \$200/ac No Cost for ECB Scouting, Farmer Management Time, or Land

## Model Summary

Stochastic variables: yield, ECB population, insecticide efficacy, % marketable for processing, net returns Monte Carlo simulations for the hierarchical model Value with Stochastic Net Returns Mean/Average/Expected Value Net Returns Risk with Stochastic Net Returns Standard Deviation of Net Returns



#### Mean Returns (\$/ac)



Economic Thresholds (ECB larvae/ear)2nd spray: 0.153rd spray: 0.204th spray: 0.25

#### Standard Deviation of Returns (\$/ac)



#### Value of IPM/Change in Mean Returns (\$/ac)



•Baythroid and Warrior more costly, so IPM more valuable

•After more applications, fewer scheduled sprays needed

#### **IPM Risk Effect/Standard Deviation Change (\$/ac)**



Summary/Conclusion First scheduled spray worth \$115-\$125/ac 1 scheduled spray and use of IPM for the 2<sup>nd</sup> spray maximizes farmer returns Value of IPM vs scheduled additional spray ranges \$5-9/ac, not including scouting cost IPM brings modest reductions in risk

Improvements to make
Specify the processing company's objective
More representative ECB population data

#### Table 4. Expected net returns (\$/ac) for each insecticide use strategy

Strategy	Insecticide					
Insecticide Use	Pounce	Mustang	Baythroid	Capture	Warrior	
No Sprays	83.16	83.16	83.16	83.16	83.16	
Schedule 1 Spray	137.68	176.65	199.86	208.78	207.45	
Schedule 1 Spray, IPM for 2 <sup>nd</sup> Spray	181.41	(183.71)	200.60	209.11	207.69	
Schedule 2 Sprays	185.80	182.53	194.33	204.28	202.12	
Schedule 2 Sprays, IPM for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Spray	189.99	(183.74)	194.40	204.32	202.13	
Schedule 3 Sprays	192.11	179.01	185.97	198.20	195.31	
Schedule 3 Sprays, IPM for 4 <sup>th</sup> Spray	(192.56)	179.30	185.96	198.20	195.30	
Schedule 4 Sprays	189.54	172.54	176.62	191.55	187.96	

#### Table 5. Net returns standard deviation (\$/ac) for each insecticide use strategy

Strategy	Insecticide						
Insecticide Use	Pounce	Mustang	Baythroid	Capture	Warrior		
No Sprays	128.50	128.50	128.50	128.50	128.50		
Schedule 1 Spray	116.00	109.34	107.71	107.86	107.83		
Schedule 1 Spray, IPM for 2 <sup>nd</sup> Spray	105.52	106.92	107.51	107.78	107.79		
Schedule 2 Sprays	107.90	107.88	107.85	108.07	108.00		
Schedule 2 Sprays, IPM for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Spray	106.16	107.29	107.85	108.07	108.02		
Schedule 3 Sprays	107.94	107.71	108.00	108.21	108.13		
Schedule 3 Sprays, IPM for 3 <sup>rd</sup> Spray	107.72	107.55	108.02	108.21	108.14		
Schedule 4 Sprays	108.52	107.77	108.13	108.31	108.22		