



Result Demonstration Report

Evaluation of Pink Eye Peas for South Texas

Cooperators: David Rodriguez, Bexar CEA Horticulture
Larry Stein, Extension Horticulturist
Raymond Taylor, Wax Company

Objective: Compare new potential pink eye peas to the current industry standards to see how they compare and if they are noteworthy for planting in Texas home garden and commercial settings.

Materials and Methods: Peas were planted on 4 June 2013 at the San Antonio Botanical Children's Garden research plots. Peas were planted on beds which were 3.5 feet wide by 28 feet long. Prior to planting the beds were fertilized with 19 – 0 – 9 sulfur coated urea nitrogen which was slightly incorporated. Three reps of six cultivars were planted: sample A, sample B, sample C, sample D, Texas Pink Eye, and Excel. A single observational plot of Golden Eye Cream was also made. A double row was planted for each rep with the rows 12 inches apart and the plants three inches apart. Over 90 % germination has occurred by day four. Plants were cared for and weeded as needed, but typically watered every Tuesday, Thursday, and Sunday. Harvest began on 26 July 2013.

Table 1: Black eye Pea Evaluation Trial at the Children's Vegetable Garden Program, San Antonio.

	Harvest Dates						Total Yield		% Shell Out	Average yields		Comments
	7/26/2013		7/30/2013		8/2/2013		Whole pods (lbs)	Shelled (lbs)				
Variety	Whole pods (lbs)	Shelled (lbs)	Whole pods (lbs)	Shelled (lbs)	Whole pods (lbs)	Shelled (lbs)	Whole pods (lbs)	Shelled (lbs)				
Sample A	13.4 c	6.7 b	7.8 a b	3.3 a	4.4 a	2.0 a b	76.8	36.1	47	25.6	12.0	Low trailing selection; may hinder harvest for both commercial as well as homeowner
Sample B	0 a	0 a	7.5 a	4.1 a b	15.4 c	7.0 c	68.6	33.9	49	22.9	11.1	Low trailing selection; may hinder harvest for both commercial as well as the homeowner
Sample C	12.8 c	6.8 b	6.8 a	3.8 a	2.4 a	1.5 a	66.2	36.1	55	22.0	12.1	Nice upright selection; should facilitate harvest
Sample D	0 a	0 a	9.8 a b	4.9 a b	13.1 c	7.3 c	68.6	36.5	53	22.9	12.2	Low trailing selection; may hinder harvest for both commercial as well as the homeowner
Texas Pink Eye	9.8 b	5.9 b	8.5 a b	4.4 a b	2.9 a	1.5 a	63.9	35.1	55	21.2	11.8	Nice upright selection; should facilitate harvest
Excel	0 a	0 a	13.5 b	7.9 b	7.2 b	3.5 b	62.1	34.7	56	20.7	11.4	Nice upright selection; should facilitate harvest harvest; smallest size pea of all varieties in the trial

Results: Sample C appeared to be the earliest maturing selection in the trial and even though sample A yielded more pods at the first harvest 26 July, the shell out was higher for C, though there was no significant difference for pea shell out for A, C or Texas Pink Eye. All varieties yielded some peas on 30 July with Excel making the most even it was only significantly different from samples B and C. Samples B and D yielded the most pods and peas on 2 August. Sample A yielded the most pods though its shell out was only 47% as opposed to sample C which had 55% as did Texas Pink Eye with Excel shelling 56%. Even though Excel had a high shelling percentage it had the smallest peas. An observational planting was made of Golden Eye Cream in this same trial and it had a 58% shell out.



Trade names of commercial products used in this report is included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by Texas AgriLife Extension Service and the Texas A&M University System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.





Acknowledgements: Special thanks go to the San Antonio Botanical Garden for allocating the use of land at the Children Vegetable Garden Program as well as providing and paying for the water. Many thanks go to Drs. Larry Stein and Parsons in providing guidance for this project. I am also grateful for the Bexar County Master Gardeners in providing labor on this project.

Trade names of commercial products used in this report is included only for better understanding and clarity. Reference to commercial products or trade names is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by Texas AgriLife Extension Service and the Texas A&M University System is implied. Readers should realize that results from one experiment do not represent conclusive evidence that the same response would occur where conditions vary.