

(7/24) (Table 7), the 14 day treatments had been applied three times (6/17,6/30,7/13) and the 21 and 28 day treatments had been applied twice (6/17,7/7 and 6/17,7/13 respectively).

As data Table 6 indicates, Chipco 26019 and Bayleton were among the fastest curative treatments used in this test. By the date of the second rating, however, compounds such as SDS 6608, Fore, and Daconil 2787 were also quite effective at arresting disease development and promoting turf recovery (Table 7).

No phytotoxicity was observed during the course of this study.

Yellow Tuft Fungicide Trial - 1989

Hancock Turfgrass Research Center, MSU, E. Lansing, MI

The 1989 yellow tuft (*Sclerophthora macrospora*) fungicide study was conducted on an irrigated Penneagle creeping bent grass putting green at the Hancock Turfgrass Research Center on the MSU campus. Treatments were applied preventively to 3'x6' plots in three replications of a random block design. Treatments were applied foliarly with a CO₂ small-plot sprayer at 30 PSI and 48 gal/A.

The initial applications were made on July 7, with subsequent applications being made on a 21 day schedule through September 28. Following each application, mild phytotoxicity was observed in the Aliette plots beginning on approximately day 2 and continuing through approximately day 9. This phytotoxicity was expressed as a bleaching of the leaf tips and a mild yellowing of the turf. Because of this phytotoxicity, the re-treatment interval was increased to 21 days from the contractual request of 14 days. The Subdue plots maintained good turfgrass quality and disease control throughout the season with no phytotoxicity observed (Tables 8 & 9).

Necrotic Ring Spot Fungicide Studies - 1989

Preventive Studies

As with our summer patch fungicide research, we decided to attempt preventive control of necrotic ring spot (*Leptosphaeria porrae*) in our fungicide field trials for the 1989 season. Two preventive studies were established on irrigated Kentucky bluegrass lawn areas in Novi, Michigan, where disease was present in previous years. All treatments were applied prior to disease occurrence in three replications of a random block design utilizing a 6' x 9' plot size. The turf was mowed at a 2" height of cut and was to be fertilized at the rate of 1 lb N/1000 ft² in May, July and September. These areas were treated for weeds and insects, however, no other fungicides were applied during the course of the season.

Table 8. Yellow Tuft Fungicide Trial - 1989

Hancock Turfgrass Research Center, MSU, E. Lansing, MI
 Number of infected plants/plot
 Rating date: 9/5/89

Treatment	Rate/1000 ft ^{2b}	Interval	I	II	III	AVE	DMR (.05) ^a
Subdue	2 fl oz	21 days	0	3	0	1.0	C
Aliette	8 oz	21 days	12 ^b	10 ^b	5 ^b	9.0	B
Control	---	---	15	24	20	19.7	A

Table 9. Yellow Tuft Fungicide Trial - 1989

Hancock Turfgrass Research Center, MSU, E. Lansing, MI
 Number of infected plants/plot
 Rating date: 9/21/89

Treatment	Rate/1000 ft ^{2b}	Interval	I	II	III	AVE	DMR (.05) ^a
Subdue	2 fl oz	21 days	0	5	1	2.0	B
Aliette	8 oz	21 days	20 ^b	26 ^b	22 ^b	22.7	A
Control	---	---	17	40	47	34.7	A

^aTreatments followed by same letter are not significantly different at 5% level.

^bMild phytotoxicity observed for approximately 10 days following each application.