SURVEY OF INSECTICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN EASTERN NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA - 2004

John L. Luecke and Alan G. Dexter Sugarbeet Research Specialist and Extension Sugarbeet Specialist

North Dakota State University - University of Minnesota Fargo, ND

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

Sugarbeet growers reported sugarbeet acreage treated with insecticide on the annual survey of sugarbeet growers (<u>Table 1</u>). Counter 15G, Counter 20G, Lorsban 15G and Mustang were primarily used as planting-time treatments, whereas Lorsban 4E and Asana were primarily applied postemergence. Counter 15G and Lorsban 15G were used on 44% and 8% of the acres, respectively, in 2004 while Counter 15G was used on 45% and Lorsban 15G on 10% of the acreage in 2003. Lorsban 4E usage was 2% in 2000, 11% in 2001 and 2% in 2002, 2003 and 2004. Mustang was used on 13% of the acreage in 2003 and 2004. Averaged over all insecticides and counties, 75% of the acreage was treated in 2004 compared to 75% in 2003, 70% in 2002, 83% in 2001, 71% in 2000, 74% in 1999 and 83% in 1998.

The grower evaluations of insect control averaged over counties is presented in <u>Table 2</u>. The satisfaction with root maggot control generally was good with 93% evaluating control as good or excellent. Other insect control was evaluated as good or excellent by 94% of the respondents.

Cutworm, wireworm, white grub, grasshopper and springtail were identified as insect problems other than sugarbeet root maggot treated with insecticide in 2004 (<u>Table 3</u>). Cutworm and wireworm were the most common.

Table 1. Insecticide use by survey respondents in 2004.

	Number of appl.	Acres	Counter 15G	Counter 20CR	Lorsban 15G	Lorsban 4E	Other ₈	Asana	Mustang	Total acres treated			
County		not treated											
		% of acres											
Cass	20	5	49	5	3	3	0	0	38	98			
Chippewaı	7	91	0	0	<1	0	0	2	0	3			
Clay ₂	26	12	43	0	17	0	0	0	28	88			
Grand Forks	21	<1	90	0	2	0	0	0	17	109			
Kittson	12	9	58	0	10	0	0	0	23	91			
Marshall	18	14	38	1	9	0	0	0	38	86			
Norman ₃	17	9	36	10	0	4	0	0	42	91			
Pembina	23	14	84	0	2	19	5	0	0	110			
Polk	55	3	79	2	11	0	0	0	8	99			
Renville4	14	78	6	0	2	4	6	6	1	23			
Richland	12	54	20	8	8	0	0	0	6	41			
Traill	12	0	73	0	19	0	0	0	8	100			
Traverse ₅	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0			
Walsh	23	0	21	59	20	8	0	0	0	108			
Wilkin ₆	15	50	49	0	1	0	0	0	0	50			
Other7	1	82	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	18			
Total	276	27	44	6	8	2	<1	<1	13	75			

Includes Swift and Kandiyohi Counties.

Includes Becker County.
Includes Mahnomen County.

Includes Redwood, Fairbault, Yellow Medicine, Lac Qui Parle, and Sibley Counties.

Includes Grant, Stevens and Big Stone Counties.

Includes Ottertail County.

Includes Stearns, Brown and No Repsonse.

Other insecticide was Thimet.

 $Table\ 2.\ In secticide\ usage\ and\ evaluation\ of\ root\ maggot\ control\ by\ survey\ respondents\ in\ 2004.\ Table\ 3.\ In sects\ other\ than\ root\ maggot\ that\ were\ treated\ for\ control,\ 2004.$

Other Insect Control Root Maggot Control No. of No. of Good Insecticide appl. Excel Fair Poor appl. Excel Fair Poor ----% of responses------% of responses-----Counter 15G Counter 20CR Lorsban 15G Lorsban 4E Mustang Asana Other Total

Table 3. Insects other than root maggot that were treated for control, 2004.

County		Number Of Appl.	Cutworm	Grasshopper	Wireworm	Other: Whitegrub (1) Springtail (3)
Cass		5	0	0	60	40
Chippewaı		3	100	0	0	0
Clay ₂		5	40	0	60	0
Grand Forks		0	0	0	0	0
Kittson		2	50	0	50	0
Marshall		1	0	0	100	0
Norman ₃		3	100	0	0	0
Pembina		0	0	0	0	0
Polk		5	0	20	60	20
Renville4		8	100	0	0	0
Richland		3	0	0	100	0
Traill		0	0	0	0	0
Traverse ₅		0	0	0	0	0
Walsh		1	0	0	100	0
Wilkin ₆		1	0	0	0	100
Other7		0	0	0	0	0
	Total	37	46	3	41	11

¹Includes Swift and Kandiyohi Counties.

²Includes Becker County.

³Includes Mahnomen County.

⁴Includes Redwood, Fairbault, Yellow Medicine, Lac Qui Parle, and Sibley Counties

⁵Includes Grant, Stevens and Big Stone Counties.

⁶Includes Ottertail County.

⁷Includes Stearns, Brown and No Response.