Survey of Insecticide Use in Sugarbeet in Eastern North Dakota and Minnesota - 2002 2002 Sugarbeet Research and Extension Reports. Volume 33, Page 132-133

## SURVEY OF INSECTICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN EASTERN NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA - 2002

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 48% and 10% of the acres, respectively, in 2002 while Counter 15G was used on 51% and Lorsban 15G on 14% of the acreage in 2001. The acreage treated with Lorsban 4E declined from 42% of the acreage in 1992 to 2% in 1996. Lorsban 4E usage was 8% in 1998, 2% in 2000, 11% in 2001 and 2% in 2002. The increased use of Lorsban 4E in 2001 was partly due to an unusual infestation of tarnished plant bug (lygus bug) especially in Polk and Grand Forks counties. This insect was less prevalent in 2002. Averaged over all insecticides and counties, 70% of the acreage was treated in 2002 compared to 83% in 2001, 71% in 2000, 74% in 1999, 83% in 1998 and 74% in 1997.

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 96% evaluating control as good or excellent. Other insect control was evaluated as good or excellent by 92% of the respondents.

Table 1. Insecticide use by survey respondents in 2002.

County	Number of appl.	Acres not treated	Counter 15G	Counter 20CR	Lorsban 15G	Lorsban 4E	Other <sup>8</sup>	Asana	Mustang	Total acres treated		
		% of acres planted										
Cass	15	12	71	12	0	0	0	0	5	88		
Chippewa <sup>1</sup>	16	70	0	0	3	3	0	9	0	15		
Clay <sup>2</sup>	28	3	47	0	21	<1	0	0	12	81		
Grand Forks	25	1	87	0	8	5	0	0	5	105		
Kittson	19	4	56	19	10	0	0	0	8	93		
Marshall	22	9	68	0	9	0	0	0	1	78		
Norman <sup>3</sup>	15	3	66	1	0	0	0	0	26	93		
Pembina	25	0	79	7	16	16	4	0	0	122		
Polk	41	0	92	1	8	3	0	0	1	105		
Renville <sup>4</sup>	11	81	0	0	0	3	0	8	0	11		
Richland	13	50	15	3	11	0	0	6	6	41		
Traill	15	0	73	0	27	0	0	0	8	108		
Traverse <sup>5</sup>	1	98	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3		
Walsh	21	0	50	11	48	6	0	0	0	115		
Wilkin <sup>6</sup>	18	32	45	5	16	0	0	0	2	68		
Other <sup>7</sup>	1	59	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	41		
Total	286	28	48	3	10	2	<1	2	4	70		

Includes Swift and Kandiyohi Counties.

Table 2. Insecticide usage and evaluation of control by survey respondents in 2002.

	Root Maggot Control					Other Insect Control					
Insecticide	No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	
			% of re	sponses		% of responses					
Counter 15G	166	68	28	2	2	87	49	46	2	2	
Counter 20CR	15	73	27	0	0	5	40	40	0	20	
Lorsban 15G	40	60	38	0	3	23	39	43	4	13	
Lorsban 4E	8	38	50	13	0	14	43	43	14	0	
Mustang	9	56	22	22	0	9	56	33	0	11	
Asana	4	100	0	0	0	18	61	33	6	0	
Other	1	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>Includes Becker County.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Includes Mahnomen County.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Includes Redwood, Fairbault, Yellow Medicine, Lac Qui Parle, and Sibley Counties.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup>Includes Grant, Stevens and Big Stone Counties.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>Includes Ottertail County.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup>Includes Stearns and non-specified Counties.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup>Other insecticide was Thimet (1 use).

Total 243 66 30 3 2 156 49 43 4 4