## SURVEY OF INSECTICIDE USE IN SUGARBEET IN EASTERN NORTH DAKOTA AND MINNESOTA - 2000

Alan G. Dexter and John L. Luecke Extension Sugarbeet Specialist and Sugarbeet Research 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, Lorsban 15G and Temik 15G were primarily used as planting-time treatments, whereas Lorsban 4E was primarily applied postemergence. Counter 15G and Lorsban 15G were used on 52% and 15% of the acres, respectively, in 2000 while Counter 15G was used on 59% and Lorsban 15G on 11% of the acreage in 1999. 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, 3% in 1999 and 2% in 2000. Lorsban 4E was primarily used for control of adult root maggot flies and fly populations have declined after 1992. Averaged over all insecticides and counties, 71% of the acreage was treated in 2000 compared to 74% in 1999, 83% in 1998, 74% in 1997 and 73% in 1996.

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 95% evaluating control as good or excellent. Other insect control was evaluated as good or excellent by 91% of the respondents.

Table 1. Insecticide use by survey respondents in 2000.

County		Number of appl.	Acres not treated	Counter 15G	Lorsban 15G	Lorsban 4E	Other <sup>7</sup>	Temik 15G	Total acres treated			
		% of acres planted										
Cass		20	38	49	8	0	5	0	62			
Chippewa <sup>1</sup>		3	92	0	5	<1	2	0	7			
Clay <sup>2</sup>		35	29	52	17	1	1	0	71			
Grand Forks		26	10	66	23	0	0	0	89			
Kittson		17	14	60	64	<1	0	0	124			
Marshall		40	6	81	13	0	0	0	94			
Norman <sup>3</sup>		26	23	71	6	1	0	0	78			
Pembina		59	1	72	13	15	<1	5	105			
Polk		72	3	83	14	1	0	0	98			
Renville <sup>4</sup>		3	96	0	3	<1	0	0	3			
Richland		12	60	21	15	<1	0	0	36			
Traill		26	8	80	12	0	0	0	92			
Traverse <sup>5</sup>		1	99	0	0	1	0	0	1			
Walsh		39	0	75	24	14	3	3	119			
Wilkin <sup>6</sup>		26	38	36	21	0	0	0	57			
Other		1	0	100	0	0	0	0	100			
	Total	406	32	52	15	2	2	1	71			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Includes Swift and Kandiyohi Counties.

Table 2. Insecticide usage and evaluation of control by survey respondents in 2000.

	Root Maggot Control						Other Insect Control					
Insecticide		No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	No. of appl.	Excel	Good	Fair	Poor	
% of responses						% of responses						
Counter 15G		278	63	34	3	1	159	54	38	4	4	
Lorsban 15G		66	67	26	3	4	43	58	33	5	5	
Lorsban 4E		14	50	29	21	0	14	21	71	7	0	
Temik 15G		6	33	50	0	17	4	0	50	0	50	
Other		7	83	0	17	0	9	44	44	11	0	
	Total	371	63	32	4	2	229	52	39	5	4	

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

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

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

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

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

Other insecticides were Counter 20CR (6 uses), Thimet (3 uses), Asana (2 uses) and Dyfonate (1 use).