Table 2. Effect of pH on nutrient availability and productivity of onions grown on muck soils in Western New York, field survey, 2010: General site information.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Field/Block** | **Grower** | **Site (pH\*)**  **Soil Type** | **Location** | **Variety (market class)** |
| **Mort A & B** | Mortellaro | **A:** Low pH (5.0)  Carlisle (CcA) | Elba muck (SE)  Calarco Rd. – field No. 6 | Festival (yellow) |
| **B:** High pH (5.9)  Carlisle (CcA) | “ | “ |
| **Panek A & B** | Panek | **A:** Low pH (5.6)  Palms muck (Pm) | Elba muck (Central)  North of Sheelar Rd. | Red Wing (red) |
| **B:** High pH (6.2)  Palms muck (Pm) | “ | “ |
| **Star A & B** | Star Growers | **A:** Low pH (6.3)  Edwards muck (Ed) | Webster muck  Field #2 SE corner | Nebula (yellow) |
| **B:** High pH (6.7)  Edwards muck (Ed) | Webster muck  Field #3 SE corner | Nebula (yellow) |
| **LS 1 A & B** | LS & Sons | **A:** Low pH (5.6)  Palms muck (Pm) | Elba Muck (Central)  Porter muck – field #5 SE end | Bunker (yellow) |
| **B:** High pH (7.3)  Palms muck (Pm) | Elba Muck (Central)  Porter muck – field #6 S end | Infinity (yellow) |
| **LS 2 A & B** | LS & Sons | **A:** Low pH (5.3)  Palms muck (Pm) | Elba Muck (Central)  Porter muck – field #5 N end | Bunker (yellow) |
| **B:** High pH (6.8)  Palms muck (Pm) | Elba Muck (Central)  Porter muck – field #4 N end | “ |

\*pH according to soil survey conducted in spring 2009. Sites were selected based on maps generated from this survey, actual pH values at these selected sites varied for the 2010 observational study.