



Fig. 5. Evapotranspiration ( $ET$ ) for corn (reported by Doss et al. (1962) for Thorsby, Alabama).

NOTE: Crop  $ET$  data for Figs. 5-9 are from water budgets of field or lysimeter plots. Potential evapotranspiration ( $ET_p$ ) and free water surface evaporation ( $E_o$ ) calculations are based on Milton, Florida, weather data.

shows  $ET$  data averaged over four years (1957, 1958, 1960, 1961) for 'Sart' sorghum from the same study of Doss et al. (1965) at Thorsby, Alabama. They concluded that there was little difference in full canopy  $ET$  between well-irrigated corn, sorghum, and cotton in their study. The  $ET$  for a second sorghum crop reached potential rates, whereas the first crop  $ET$  was slightly higher than  $ET_p$  for 30 days (June 15 to July 15).

Water budget  $ET$  data were presented by Saxena et al. (1971) for tomatoes grown in experimental field plots near Live Oak in 1969. We averaged their data over irrigation and non-irrigation treatments and smoothed them using 1:3:1 weighting values for previous, current, and subsequent values, respectively. Data from May 15 to 23 and July 2 to 17 were omitted because heavy rainfall produced percolation that was not measured. The  $ET$  of tomatoes (Figure 8) increased rapidly from about 2 mm/day on April 27 to peak values of near 5 mm/day on June 1. The tomatoes were transplanted as seedlings, which allowed more rapid