SURVEY OF FUNGICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN MINNESOTA AND EASTERN NORTH DAKOTA IN 2014

Peter C. Hakk¹, Aaron L. Carlson¹, Mohamed F.R. Khan², Thomas J. Peters², and Mark A. Boetel³

¹Sugarbeet Research Specialists and ²Extension Sugarbeet Specialists North Dakota State University & University of Minnesota, Fargo, ND and ³Professor, Dept. of Entomology, North Dakota State University

Other portions of the survey are published in the Weed Control and Entomology sections.

Sugarbeet growers were asked to report the fungicide used and the number of applications to sugarbeet acreage as part of the annual survey of sugarbeet growers. Multiple applications of fungicides to the same acreage were counted as multiple acres treated; thus, acres treated may exceed 100% of acres planted. All fungicides in Table 1 would be used primarily for control of Cercospora leaf spot (CLS).

Fungicide use for CLS in 2014, averaged over all counties, was 179% of respondent acres as compared to 218% in 2013, 277% in 2012, 259% in 2011, 225% in 2010, 156% in 2009, 222% in 2008, 242% in 2007, 208 % in 2006, and 206% in 2005 (Table 1). Acres not treated with fungicide were 3% in 2014 as compared to 4% in 2013, 11% in 2012, 3% in 2011 and 2010, 9% in 2009, less than 1% in 2008, 1% in 2007, 2% in 2006, and 6% in 2005. Fungicide usage was greatest in Renville County in 2014 with 283% of respondent acres receiving fungicides for control of CLS. The greatest fungicide use in 2013, 2012, and 2011 was in Chippewa County with 352%, 476% and 343% of acres, respectively, 2010 was in Kandiyohi County with 437%, and in 1998 in Chippewa County with 852%. Headline, Inspire XT, Super/Agri Tin and Proline were the most commonly used fungicides in 2014 and were used on 65%, 31%, 28% and 24% of the acres respectively.

The percentage of respondents who named Cercospora as their worst production problem in sugarbeet dropped from 36% in 1998 to 0% in 2005, 3% in 2010, 1% in 2011, 7% in 2012, <1% in 2013 and 0% in 2014. Triazoles, either by themselves or in tank-mixtures, were applied to 69% of respondent acres in 2014, compared to 58% of respondent acres in 2013, 82% in 2012, 97% in 2011, and 88% in 2010. Headline was used on 65% of the sugarbeet acreage in 2014, 70% in 2013, 71% in 2012, 88% in 2011, and 87% in 2010. In 2014, 2013, 2012, 2011, 2010, and 2009, Headline was the only fungicide to be applied by respondents from all counties. Prior to 2009, the most recent occurrence of only one fungicide being applied by respondents from all counties was in 1997 and the fungicide was Super Tin. Strobilurin fungicides (Headline, Gem, and Priaxor) were applied either alone or in tank mixtures to 71% of acres in 2014, 78% in 2013, 77% in 2012, 91% in 2011, and 89% in 2010.

The number of fungicide applications varied from zero to four times per respondent in 2014 (Table 2). The average number of applications per acre was 1.8 in 2014, 2.2 in 2013, 2.8 in 2012, 2.6 in 2011, and 2.3 in 2010.

Averaged over fungicides and counties, 86% of treated acres were sprayed with a ground sprayer while 14% were treated with an aerial sprayer in 2014 (Table 3). The usage of ground sprayers ranged from 0% in Traill County to 100% in Marshall County. The overall usage of ground sprayers was 85% in 2013, 82% in 2012, 78% in 2011 and 2010, 86% in 2009, 77% in 2008, 2007, and 2006, and 79% in 2005.

The date of the first fungicide application for Cercospora ranged from June 20 to after August 10 (Table 4). Four percent of respondents began spraying prior to July 11 in 2014, while 10% of respondents in 2013, 12% in 2011 and 2010 began spraying for Cercospora prior to July 11.

The date of the last fungicide application ranged from before August 1 to after September 10 (Table 5). The last fungicide application was after August 20 by 70% of the respondents and after August 31 by 31% of the respondents. The last fungicide application was before August 11 by 12% of the respondents.

Cercospora leaf spot control was evaluated as excellent or good by 94% of the survey respondents averaged over all fungicides (Table 6). Five percent of responses indicated an unsure level of CLS control.

Fungicides were evaluated for Rhizoctonia control and crop injury in 2014 (Table 7). Sixteen responses were reported for in-furrow fungicide applications. Headline was applied in-furrow in 75% of responses, while Quadris was applied in-furrow in 19%. Fifty-three post emergence responses were reported. Quadris was applied in 89% of responses while Proline and Headline were each applied on 4% of acres.

Fifty-five percent of responses indicated a post emergence fungicide applied from June 1 to 15 (Table 8). Current recommendations for controlling Rhizoctonia are to apply labeled fungicides to sugarbeet either in-furrow at planting or in a 7 inch band prior to infection (prior to soil temperatures reaching $62^{\circ}F$ at the 4 inch depth because infection takes place $\geq 65^{\circ}F$) or at both timings. Eleven percent of responses were for post emergence applications made after July 1 which is most likely too late to help control Rhizoctonia. Quadris was band applied to 82% of reported acres, while Headline and Proline were each broadcast to 100% of reported acres (Table 9).

An evaluation of satisfaction of seed treatments was conducted (Table 10). In 2014, 75% of respondents were satisfied with Metlock + Rizolex + Kabina, 73% were satisfied with Tachigaren, 73% were satisfied with Kabina, and 67% were satisfied with Metlock + Rizolex. One percent of respondents in 2014 reported being unsatisfied with Kabina while 6% were unsatisfied with Metlock + Rizolex + Kabina. Ninety-seven percent of reported acres were treated with a seed treatment to protect against root pathogens.

Table 1. Fungicide use for Cercospora control by survey respondents in 2014.

| | Respondent | | Super/ | | | Triazol | es | Strobi | lurins | | Tank | -mixes | | | Total |
|-----------------------|------------|---------|--------|------|------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|------|--------|--------|---------------------|---------|
| | acres | Not | Agri | Top- | Pro- | Emi- | Inspire | Head- | | Tin+ | Tin+ | EBDC+ | EBDC | | acres |
| County | planted9 | treated | Tin | sin | line | nent | XT | line | Gem | Topsin | | | +Hdlne | Other ¹⁰ | treated |
| | | | | | | | <u></u> | % of acre | es plante | ed | | | | | |
| Cass | 4,393 | 26 | 3 | - | - | - | 39 | 71 | - | 9 | - | - | - | - | 121 |
| Chippewa ¹ | 7,611 | 8 | 65 | - | 40 | 27 | - | 17 | 6 | - | - | 21 | - | 28 | 202 |
| Clay ² | 5,244 | - | 13 | - | - | - | 34 | 61 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 108 |
| Grand Forks | 6,009 | - | 52 | - | - | - | 66 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 217 |
| Kittson | 920 | 9 | - | - | - | - | - | 87 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 87 |
| Marshall | 6,359 | - | - | - | 40 | 11 | - | 91 | - | - | 8 | - | 8 | - | 159 |
| Norman ³ | 5,237 | - | 2 | - | 8 | - | 82 | 98 | - | 18 | 8 | - | - | - | 216 |
| Pembina | 5,132 | 8 | 16 | - | - | - | - | 70 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 86 |
| Polk ⁴ | 14,111 | 2 | 14 | 8 | 37 | 8 | 18 | 84 | - | 12 | 3 | 2 | - | 2 | 188 |
| Renville ⁵ | 8,939 | - | 96 | - | 80 | 19 | - | 25 | 60 | - | - | 2 | - | 1 | 283 |
| Richland ⁶ | 8,301 | - | 22 | - | 33 | 19 | 58 | 71 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 203 |
| Traill | 492 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100 | - | 100 | - | - | - | - | 200 |
| Traverse ⁷ | 7,370 | 2 | 29 | - | 11 | 21 | 37 | 69 | 4 | - | - | - | - | - | 170 |
| Walsh | 3,427 | - | 37 | 11 | 4 | - | 30 | 81 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 163 |
| Wilkin ⁸ | 10,021 | 4 | 9 | - | 6 | 12 | 57 | 34 | - | - | - | - | - | 19 | 137 |
| Total | 93,566 | 3 | 28 | 2 | 24 | 11 | 31 | 65 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 179 |

¹Includes Kandiyohi and Swift Counties

²Includes Becker County

³Includes Mahnomen County

⁴Includes Pennington and Red Lake Counties

⁵Includes Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Redwood, Stearns, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁶Includes Roberts (SD) County

⁷Includes Grant and Stevens Counties

⁸Includes Otter Tail County

⁹Respondent acres planted does not include acres by respondents who skipped the cercospora questions on the survey.

¹⁰Other includes: Topguard, Priaxor

Table 2. Number of fungicide applications by survey respondents in 2014.

| | | | <u> </u> | Number of A | Applications per | Respondent | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|----|----------|-------------|------------------|------------|---|-----------------|
| County | Respondents | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | NR ⁹ |
| | • | | | % | of respondents | | | |
| Cass | 7 | 14 | 14 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Chippewa ¹ | 14 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 43 | 14 | 0 | 0 |
| Clay ² | 11 | 0 | 73 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Grand Forks | 9 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kittson | 3 | 33 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Marshall | 9 | 0 | 33 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Norman ³ | 6 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 67 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pembina | 8 | 13 | 75 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Polk ⁴ | 29 | 7 | 3 | 72 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Renville ⁵ | 20 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 10 | 0 | 0 |
| Richland ⁶ | 10 | 0 | 10 | 60 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traill | 2 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Traverse ⁷ | 11 | 9 | 18 | 55 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Walsh | 8 | 0 | 38 | 38 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wilkin ⁸ | 20 | 10 | 45 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 167 | 5 | 24 | 46 | 23 | 2 | 0 | 0 |

¹Includes Kandiyohi and Swift Counties

Table 3. Ground and aerial application of fungicides in 2014.

| County | | Treated Acres | Ground | Aerial |
|-----------------------|-------|---------------|-----------|-----------|
| | | | % of trea | ted acres |
| Cass | | 5,330 | 73 | 27 |
| Chippewa ¹ | | 15,362 | 98 | 2 |
| Clay ² | | 5,654 | 76 | 24 |
| Grand Forks | | 13,061 | 90 | 10 |
| Kittson | | 800 | 68 | 33 |
| Marshall | | 10,094 | 100 | 0 |
| Norman ³ | | 11,312 | 92 | 8 |
| Pembina | | 4,433 | 79 | 21 |
| Polk ⁴ | | 26,564 | 71 | 29 |
| Renville ⁵ | | 25,278 | 95 | 5 |
| Richland ⁶ | | 16,821 | 80 | 20 |
| Traill | | 984 | 0 | 100 |
| Traverse ⁷ | | 12,557 | 92 | 8 |
| Walsh | | 5,596 | 85 | 15 |
| Wilkin ⁸ | | 13,685 | 83 | 17 |
| | Total | 167,531 | 86 | 14 |

¹Includes Kandiyohi and Swift Counties

²Includes Becker County

³Includes Mahnomen County

⁴Includes Pennington and Red Lake Counties

⁵Includes Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Redwood, Stearns, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁶Includes Roberts (SD) County

⁷Includes Grant and Stevens Counties

⁸Includes Otter Tail County

⁹NR=no response

²Includes Becker County

³Includes Mahnomen County

⁴Includes Pennington and Red Lake Counties

⁵Includes Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Redwood, Stearns, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁶Includes Roberts (SD) County

⁷Includes Grant and Stevens Counties

⁸Includes Otter Tail County

Table 4. Date of first fungicide application for CLS in 2014.

| County | 1 | Number of Respondents | June 20-30 | July 1-10 | July 11-20 | July 21-31 | Aug. 1-10 | After Aug. 10 |
|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|------------|-----------|------------|------------|-----------|---------------|
| | | | | | % of re | spondents | | |
| Cass | | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | 40 |
| Chippewa ¹ | | 13 | 15 | 0 | 38 | 38 | 8 | 0 |
| Clay ² | | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 10 | 80 |
| Grand Forks | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 33 | 22 |
| Kittson | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Marshall | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 | 56 |
| Norman ³ | | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | 50 | 17 |
| Pembina | | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 | 71 |
| Polk ⁴ | | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 36 | 36 |
| Renville ⁵ | | 20 | 0 | 15 | 55 | 20 | 10 | 0 |
| Richland ⁶ | | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 30 | 20 |
| Traill | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Traverse ⁷ | | 10 | 0 | 20 | 10 | 20 | 30 | 20 |
| Walsh | | 8 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 25 | 38 | 25 |
| Wilkin ⁸ | | 18 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 17 | 44 | 17 |
| | Total | 154 | 1 | 3 | 16 | 22 | 28 | 29 |

¹Includes Kandiyohi and Swift Counties

| County | Number of Respondents | Before Aug. 1 | Aug. 1-10 | Aug. 11-20 | Aug. 21-31 | Sept. 1-10 | After Sept. 10 |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|-------------|------------|------------|----------------|
| | | | | % of respon | ndents | | |
| Cass | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 67 | 17 | 17 |
| Chippewa ¹ | 13 | 8 | 15 | 46 | 8 | 15 | 8 |
| Clay ² | 9 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 44 | 22 | 11 |
| Grand Forks | 9 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 56 | 33 | 0 |
| Kittson | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Marshall | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 50 | 0 |
| Norman ³ | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 17 | 33 |
| Pembina | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 75 | 25 | 0 |
| Polk ⁴ | 26 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 38 | 50 | 8 |
| Renville ⁵ | 20 | 0 | 20 | 35 | 35 | 10 | 0 |
| Richland ⁶ | 9 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 56 | 33 | 0 |
| Traill | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 |
| Traverse ⁷ | 10 | 0 | 10 | 40 | 50 | 0 | 0 |
| Walsh | 6 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 17 |
| Wilkin ⁸ | 17 | 12 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 6 | 0 |
| Total | 147 | 2 | 10 | 17 | 39 | 26 | 5 |

¹Includes Kandiyohi and Swift Counties

²Includes Becker County

³Includes Mahnomen County

⁴Includes Pennington and Red Lake Counties

⁵Includes Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Redwood, Stearns, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁶Includes Roberts (SD) County

⁷Includes Grant and Stevens Counties

⁸Includes Otter Tail County

²Includes Becker County

³Includes Mahnomen County

⁴Includes Pennington and Red Lake Counties

⁵Includes Lac Qui Parle, McLeod, Redwood, Stearns, and Yellow Medicine Counties

⁶Includes Roberts (SD) County

⁷Includes Grant and Stevens Counties

⁸Includes Otter Tail County

Table 6. Fungicide control of Cercospora leaf spot in 2014.

| Fungicide | Number of Responses | Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor | Unsure |
|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|------|----------------|------|--------|
| | | | | % of responses | | |
| Super Tin/Agri Tin | 57 | 61 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Topsin | 4 | 75 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Proline | 39 | 64 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Eminent | 24 | 54 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Inspire XT | 47 | 77 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Headline | 115 | 64 | 29 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Gem | 11 | 36 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tin+Topsin | 3 | 67 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tin+Triazole | 9 | 78 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| EBDC+Triazole | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Tin+Headline | 3 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other ¹ | 7 | 57 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Total | 320 | 65 | 29 | 1 | 0 | 5 |

¹Other includes Topguard, Priaxor

Table 7. Evaluation of fungicides for Rhizoctonia control and crop injury in 2014.

| | | _ | | Cı | op Injury | | | | Rhizoctonia Control | | | |
|----------------------|---------|-----------|------|----------------|-----------|-----|--------|-----|---------------------|------|------|--------|
| Application Method | Acres | - | | | | | | | | | | |
| Fungicide | Treated | Responses | None | Slight | Mod | Sev | Unsure | Exc | Good | Fair | Poor | Unsure |
| In-Furrow | | | | % of responses | | | | | % of responses | | | |
| Quadris | 1,125 | 3 | 67 | 33 | Ō | 0 | 0 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Headline | 3,113 | 12 | 92 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 25 | 58 | 8 | 0 | 8 |
| Unspecified | 440 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| <u>Foliar</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quadris ¹ | 18,435 | 48 | 94 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 58 | 10 | 0 | 15 |
| Proline | 1,010 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 |
| Headline | 430 | 2 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Priaxor | 350 | 1 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 24,903 | 69 | 93 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 19 | 57 | 13 | 0 | 12 |

¹Quadris includes generic azoxystrobin Satori

Table 8. Date of POST fungicide application for Rhizoctonia control in sugarbeet in 2014.

| | No. of | | | | | | _ |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| Fungicide | Responses | Before May 1 | May 1-15 | May 16-31 | June 1-15 | June 16-30 | After July 1 |
| | | | | % of res | sponses | | |
| Quadris ¹ | 48 | 0 | 13 | 4 | 60 | 21 | 2 |
| Proline | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Headline | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Priaxor | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |
| Total | 53 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 55 | 19 | 11 |

¹Quadris includes generic azoxystrobin Satori

Table 9. Method of application of POST fungicides applied for Rhizoctonia control in sugarbeet in 2014.

| Fungicide | No. responses | Acres Treated | Band | Broadcast |
|----------------------|---------------|---------------|------|---------------|
| | | | % of | acres treated |
| Quadris ¹ | 48 | 18,435 | 82 | 18 |
| Headline | 2 | 1,010 | 0 | 100 |
| Proline | 2 | 430 | 0 | 100 |
| Priaxor | 1 | 350 | 0 | 100 |
| Total | 53 | 20,225 | 75 | 25 |

¹Quadris includes generic azoxystrobin Satori

Table 10. Rating of seed treatment performance in sugarbeet in 2014.

| Seed Treatment | Acres Treated | Responses | Satisfied | Mixed Performance | Unsatisfied | No Response |
|------------------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|-------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | | % of respo | onses | |
| Kabina | 38,600 | 86 | 73 | 26 | 1 | 0 |
| Metlock+Rizolex | 7,139 | 21 | 67 | 33 | 0 | 0 |
| Metlock+Rizolex+Kabina | 6,278 | 16 | 75 | 19 | 6 | 0 |
| Tachigaren | 38,417 | 82 | 73 | 27 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 90,434 | 205 | 73 | 26 | 1 | 0 |