

SURVEY OF INSECTICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN MINNESOTA AND EASTERN NORTH DAKOTA IN 2010

Aaron L. Carlson¹, John L. Luecke¹, Mark A. Boetel², Mohamed F.R. Khan¹, and Jeff M. Stachler¹

¹Sugarbeet Research Technician, Sugarbeet Research Specialist, Extension Sugarbeet Specialist, and Extension Sugarbeet Specialist

North Dakota State University - University of Minnesota, Fargo, ND and

²Associate Professor, Dept. of Entomology, North Dakota State University

Other portions of the survey are published in the Weed Control and Plant Pathology sections of this publication.

Sugarbeet growers reported on their 2010 insecticide use in sugarbeet acreage by completing the annual pesticide use survey conducted by the NDSU Extension Service. This year's survey reports on insecticide usage patterns for over 138,000 acres in Minnesota and eastern North Dakota (Table 1). Counter 15G, Counter 20CR, Lorsban 15G, and Mustang Max were primarily used as planting-time treatments, whereas Lorsban 4E and Asana were mostly applied postemergence. Poncho Beta was used as a seed treatment at planting. Poncho Beta was commercially available for the first time in 2009 and it was used on 29% of the sugarbeet acreage that year. In 2010, Poncho Beta was used on 36% of the acres. Counter 15G and Lorsban 15G were used on 19% and 2% of the acres, respectively, in 2010, while Counter 15G and Lorsban 15G were applied to 19 and 6% of the acreage, respectively, in 2009. Lorsban 4E was applied to 4% of sugarbeet acres in 2005, 5% in 2006, 4% in 2007, 2% in 2008, 4% in 2009, and 10% in 2010. Mustang was used on 21% of the acreage in 2005, 28% in 2006, 23% in 2007, 31% in 2008, 10% in 2009, and 14% in 2010. Averaged over all insecticides and counties, 90% of the respondents' acreage was treated in 2010 compared to 71% in 2009, 92% in 2008, 80% in 2007, 83% in 2006, and 79% in 2005.

Table 1. Insecticide use by survey respondents in 2010.

| County | Respondent acres planted | Number of applications | Not treated | Poncho Beta | Counter 15G | Counter 20G | % of acres planted | | | | | Total acres treated |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| | | | | | | | Mustang | Lorsban 4E | Lorsban 15G | Asana | Other ⁶ | |
| Becker | 2,172 | 4 | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | 100 |
| Cass | 2,958 | 8 | - | 71 | 19 | 10 | 10 | - | - | - | - | 110 |
| Chippewa ¹ | 3,150 | 0 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 0 |
| Clay | 11,446 | 25 | 7 | 30 | 51 | - | - | 22 | 5 | - | 4 | 112 |
| Grand Forks | 7,337 | 12 | 40 | 17 | 21 | 10 | 14 | 1 | - | - | - | 63 |
| Kandiyohi | 2,549 | 4 | 76 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 24 | - | 24 |
| Kittson | 5,009 | 11 | 8 | 15 | 2 | - | 75 | - | - | - | - | 92 |
| Marshall | 12,423 | 20 | 18 | 64 | 14 | - | 5 | 2 | - | - | - | 85 |
| Norman ² | 7,028 | 18 | 6 | 33 | 11 | 3 | 72 | 2 | - | - | - | 121 |
| Pembina | 17,390 | 31 | - | 82 | 8 | 3 | - | 40 | 2 | - | 19 | 154 |
| Polk | 22,817 | 44 | 12 | 30 | 43 | 12 | 6 | - | 1 | - | <1 | 93 |
| Renville ³ | 6,170 | 6 | 82 | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | 17 | - | 18 |
| Richland | 5,857 | 7 | 54 | 8 | 19 | 3 | 12 | - | - | 5 | - | 47 |
| Trail | 7,118 | 16 | 7 | 50 | 12 | - | 34 | - | 3 | - | - | 99 |
| Traverse ⁴ | 4,046 | 1 | 57 | 43 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 43 |
| Walsh | 6,790 | 21 | 5 | 57 | 17 | - | - | 47 | 8 | - | 15 | 144 |
| Wilkin ⁵ | 8,418 | 6 | 63 | - | 16 | - | 20 | - | 1 | - | - | 37 |
| No Response | 5,610 | 12 | 46 | 19 | 4 | 12 | 13 | - | 7 | - | - | 55 |
| Total | 138,288 | 246 | 24 | 36 | 19 | 4 | 14 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 90 |

¹Includes Swift Counties

²Includes Mahnomen County

³Includes Faribault, Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Meeker, Redwood, Sibley, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁴Includes Big Stone, Grant, and Stevens Counties

⁵Includes Ottertail County

⁶Includes Cruiser (1%), Counter 20CR (1%), and Thimet 20G (2%)

Grower evaluations of insect control, averaged over counties, are presented in Table 2. Satisfaction with sugarbeet root maggot control insecticides generally was good with 90% evaluating control as good or excellent. Performance of other insect control materials was rated as good or excellent by 93% of the respondents.

Table 2. Evaluation of root maggot and other insect control by survey respondents in 2010.

| Insecticide | Root Maggot Control | | | | | Other Insect Control | | | | | | |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------|------|------|------|----------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------|------|--|--|
| | No. of Responses | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | No. of Responses | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | | |
| | | -----% of responses----- | | | | | | -----% of responses----- | | | | |
| Asana | 1 | 100 | - | - | - | 9 | 22 | 78 | - | - | | |
| Counter 15G | 59 | 69 | 27 | 2 | 2 | 49 | 73 | 23 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Counter 20G | 10 | 70 | 20 | 10 | - | 8 | 100 | - | - | - | | |
| Counter 20CR | 3 | 100 | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | - | 100 | | |
| Cruiser | 2 | 100 | - | - | - | 2 | 50 | 50 | - | - | | |
| Lorsban 15G | 8 | 88 | 12 | - | - | 4 | 75 | 25 | - | - | | |
| Lorsban 4E | 21 | 43 | 43 | 14 | - | 10 | 60 | 40 | - | - | | |
| Mustang | 22 | 27 | 45 | 14 | 14 | 32 | 44 | 47 | 9 | - | | |
| Poncho Beta | 80 | 50 | 39 | 10 | 1 | 60 | 55 | 35 | 3 | 7 | | |
| Thimet 20G | 4 | 100 | - | - | - | 0 | - | - | - | - | | |
| Total | 210 | 57 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 175 | 59 | 34 | 3 | 3 | | |

Cutworms, wireworms, springtails, and white grubs were identified as insect problems other than sugarbeet root maggot for areas treated with insecticides in 2010 (Table 3). Cutworms were the most common non-maggot pest problem.

Table 3. Insects other than root maggot that were treated for control by survey respondents in 2010.

| County | Number of Respondents | Cutworm | Grasshopper | Wireworm | Springtail | White Grub |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------|-------------|----------|------------|------------|
| | | | | | | |
| Becker | 1 | - | - | 100 | - | - |
| Cass | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Chippewa ¹ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Clay | 6 | - | - | 33 | 50 | 17 |
| Grand Forks | 1 | - | - | - | 100 | - |
| Kandiyohi | 2 | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| Kittson | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Marshall | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Norman ² | 1 | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| Pembina | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Polk | 2 | - | - | 50 | 50 | - |
| Renville ³ | 4 | 100 | - | - | - | - |
| Richland | 2 | 50 | - | - | - | 50 |
| Trail | 2 | 50 | - | - | 50 | - |
| Traverse ⁴ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Walsh | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Wilkin ⁵ | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| No Response | 0 | - | - | - | - | - |
| Total | 21 | 43 | 0 | 19 | 29 | 9 |

¹Includes Swift Counties

²Includes Mahnomon County

³Includes Faribault, Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Meeker, Redwood, Sibley, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁴Includes Big Stone, Grant, and Stevens Counties

⁵Includes Ottertail County

Survey data on placement methods used by growers in 2010 is presented in Table 4. The majority (63 of 89) of survey respondents that applied a planting-time granular insecticide used Counter 15G, and nearly equal numbers used band (32%) or modified in-furrow placement (37%). Interestingly, 25% of the producers using Lorsban 15G chose to apply it using modified in-furrow placement. This placement is not recommended by NDSU Extension because Lorsban 15G is more likely to be phytotoxic and cause yield reductions when applied modified in-furrow.

Table 4. Placement of granular insecticides used in sugarbeet in 2010.

| Insecticide | No. of Responses | Band | Mod. In-Furrow | Spoon | No Response |
|--------------|------------------|------|----------------|-------|-------------|
| | | | | | |
| Counter 15G | 63 | 32 | 37 | 19 | 13 |
| Counter 20CR | 4 | 25 | 50 | - | 25 |
| Counter 20G | 10 | 20 | 50 | 10 | 20 |
| Lorsban 15G | 8 | 38 | 25 | 12 | 25 |
| Thimet 20G | 4 | 50 | - | - | 50 |
| Total | 89 | 31 | 36 | 16 | 17 |