

**SURVEY OF INSECTICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN EASTERN
NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA - 2003**

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 (Table 1). 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 45% and 10% of the acres, respectively, in 2003 while Counter 15G was used on 48% and Lorsban 15G on 10% of the acreage in 2002. Lorsban 4E usage was 2% in 2000, 11% in 2001, 2% in 2002 and 2% in 2003. Averaged over all insecticides and counties, 75% of the acreage was treated in 2003 compared to 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 Table 2. The satisfaction with root maggot control generally was good with 97% evaluating control as good or excellent. Other insect control was evaluated as good or excellent by 93% of the respondents.

Cutworm, wireworm, white grub, grasshopper, armyworm, springtail and lygus were identified as insect problems treated with insecticide in 2003 (Table 3). Cutworm and wireworm were the most common.

Table 1. Insecticide use by survey respondents in 2003.

Number	Acres	Total
--------	-------	-------

County	of appl.	not treated	Counter 15G	Counter 20CR	Lorsban 15G	Lorsban 4E	Other ⁸	Asana	Mustang	acres treated
-----% of acres-----										
Cass	15	5	73	8	0	0	0	0	15	96
Chippewa ¹	7	81	0	0	<1	2	0	2	0	4
Clay ²	30	1	49	0	25	0	0	0	23	97
Grand Forks	20	0	69	0	26	<1	0	4	14	113
Kittson	19	4	38	0	9	0	0	0	45	92
Marshall	26	0	74	0	5	0	0	0	22	101
Norman ³	14	12	43	0	11	0	0	0	36	90
Pembina	32	0	71	19	9	21	5	0	<1	125
Polk	55	4	81	0	6	5	1	0	8	101
Renville ⁴	6	84	0	0	<1	1	0	5	0	6
Richland	10	43	10	5	12	0	0	1	14	42
Traill	14	8	66	0	0	0	0	0	30	96
Traverse ⁵	2	84	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	16
Walsh	21	1	52	21	26	0	0	0	0	99
Wilkin ⁶	17	31	37	1	14	0	0	<1	0	52
Other ⁷	2	28	0	0	6	0	0	0	57	54
Total	413	24	45	3	10	2	<1	2	13	75

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, Meeker, Nicollet and Brown.

⁸Other insecticides were Thimet, Temik and Malathion.

Table 2. Insecticide usage and evaluation of root maggot control by survey respondents in 2003.

Insecticide	Root Maggot Control					Other Insect Control				
	No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor
-----% of responses-----										
Counter 15G	160	69	30	1	0	94	52	44	4	0
Counter 20CR	12	50	50	0	0	7	29	57	14	0
Lorsban 15G	34	65	26	3	6	23	52	30	13	4
Lorsban 4E	6	33	67	0	0	10	60	20	20	0
Mustang	27	37	59	0	4	37	41	51	8	0
Asana	1	100	0	0	0	12	58	42	0	0
Other	3	100	0	0	0	2	50	50	0	0
Total	243	63	34	1	1	185	50	43	7	1

Table 3. Insects other than root maggot that were treated for control, 2003.

County	Number of appl.	Cutworm	Grasshopper	Wireworm	Other: Whitegrub (3) Armyworm (1) Springtail (1) Lygus (1)
-----% of responses-----					
Cass	1	0	0	0	100

Chippewa ¹	6	83	0	0	17
Clay ²	3	67	0	33	0
Grand Forks	0	0	0	0	0
Kittson	5	40	0	40	20
Marshall	1	0	0	0	100
Norman ³	1	0	0	0	100
Pembina	0	0	0	0	0
Polk	3	67	0	0	33
Renville ⁴	4	75	25	0	0
Richland	4	0	0	50	50
Traill	2	0	50	50	0
Traverse ⁵	1	100	0	0	0
Walsh	1	100	0	0	0
Wilkin ⁶	5	40	0	40	20
Other ⁷	0	0	0	0	0
Total	37	49	5	22	24

¹Includes Swift and Kandiyohi Counties.

²Includes Becker County.

³Includes Mahnommen County.

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

⁵Includes Grant, Stevens and Big Stone Counties.

⁶Includes Ottertail County.

⁷Includes Stearns, Meeker, Nicollet and Brown.