

BY JOHN STIER, PH.D.

VELVET TOUCH

Researchers consider velvet bentgrass as an alternative to creeping bentgrass, evaluating whether it can provide high-quality golf turf and reduce the need for fertilizer, water and fungicide inputs.

Most of us take for granted the creeping bentgrass (*Agrostis stolonifera* L.) turf used for putting greens. Daily irrigation and routine disease control practices are just an accepted fact of management costs. But creeping bentgrass only has been used commonly on putting greens for about 50 years. Can there be another, lower maintenance alternative? The turfgrass research program at the University of Wisconsin-Madison has been developing approaches towards lower cost, more sustainable golf courses since the early 1990s, and the potential looks good. We're particularly interested in addressing fungicide, nutrient and water issues.

Superintendents are constantly dealing with new restrictions on fungicide use.

Mercury-based fungicides met their end a couple of decades ago. More recently, restrictions have been placed on the more common, lower cost fungicides such as PCNB, chlorothalonil and iprodione. PCNB will likely be phased out in the next two to three years, eliminating arguably the most cost-effective means for controlling snow mold disease.

Golf courses of the future will need to be maintained with less reliance on fungicides. The most practical way to reduce fungicide requirements is to use grasses that are inherently resistant to diseases.

Fertilizer use on golf courses also is becoming a contentious issue. The large and sudden increase in nitrogen costs in 2008

had superintendents asking me when was the single best time to fertilize, as they could only afford a single application for the year. Bans, or at least restrictions, on nitrogen use are likely to occur, beginning in the Northeast as the Environmental Protection Agency seeks to reduce nitrogen fertilization of golf courses. States such as Minnesota and Wisconsin have already severely restricted phosphorus fertilizer applications to turf.

Water restrictions are the up-and-coming bane of golf course management in many areas of the country and are no longer restricted to the South. It's becoming an accepted fact that many golf courses may have to cut back their use of potable water due



'L-93' creeping bentgrass (left) had coarser leaf texture and lower turf density than 'Vesper' velvet bentgrass (right) when maintained as putting greens in Madison, Wis.

to other public demands. Last year the state of Wisconsin began requiring golf courses to submit information on their water use. This is likely the first step towards limiting ground and surface water withdrawals for irrigation – and Wisconsin is considered a water-rich state.

One of the most insidious and least-recognized challenges to the golf course industry is the development of invasive species rules at both state and federal levels. Virtually all turfgrass species commonly used on golf courses are on one or more invasive species lists. Creeping bentgrass, for example, is listed by The Nature Conservancy as a prime example of an invasive species (<http://wiki.bugwood.org/Invasipedia>).

Some states (e.g., Massachusetts and Wisconsin) are beginning to pass bans on the sale and transport of plants deemed invasive. Publicly-funded sites (e.g., municipal golf courses) tend to be the first areas to respond to actual and impending regulations, eventually followed by private industry.

HISTORY OF VELVET BENTGRASS

Velvet bentgrass (*Agrostis canina* L.) is native

to North America, though it was also likely introduced about 100 years ago in bentgrass seed mixtures known as South German bentgrass (Brilman, 2003). Its leaves are extremely fine-textured, producing a dense, uniform turf well-suited for putting greens. During the first half of the 20th century, it was deemed a better putting green surface than creeping bentgrass (Monteith and Welton, 1932). Problems with seed supply, coupled with the advent of seeded types of creeping bentgrass and good marketing in the 1950s, motivated golf courses to begin using creeping bentgrass.

In the 1960s, Dr. Skogley developed the first new velvet bentgrass in nearly 30 years. Named 'Kingston,' it struggled to gain acceptance because its light green color caused managers to over-fertilize it, leading to excessive thatch development (Brilman and Meyer, 2000).

Other breeders, notably Dr. Leah Brilman of Seed Research of Oregon and Dr. Bridget Ruemmele of the University of Rhode Island, began developing new velvet bentgrass cultivars in the 1990s. In the past 10 years several cultivars have been released

by various companies, including 'SR7200,' 'Vesper,' 'Legendary,' and 'Greenwich'.

Velvet bentgrass has the capacity to provide high-quality golf turf with reduced reliance on water and chemical inputs. In fairway situations, velvet bentgrass has been shown to use less water than creeping bentgrass (DaCosta and Huang, 2006a). Velvet bentgrass has better drought tolerance than other bentgrass species, perhaps partly because it uses more of its energy for root production, which allows it to extract water better from the soil (DaCosta and Huang, 2006b).

The fine leaf texture of velvet bentgrass may lead some people to think it's less traffic tolerant than creeping bentgrass, and so won't hold up under typical putting green traffic. Scientists at Rutgers University, though, proved otherwise. They planted two cultivars of velvet bentgrass and 13 creeping bentgrasses, then tested them under four levels of traffic (Cashel et al., 2005). The two velvet bentgrass cultivars, Vesper and SR7200, maintained excellent turf over the three-year test. The velvet bentgrasses always had better turf quality than the



Velvet bentgrass greens had the same level of green speed as creeping bentgrasses, regardless of mowing heights, while providing an even denser turf.

creeping bentgrasses, as good or better turf density, and essentially no annual bluegrass (*Poa annua* L.). Greens seeded to creeping bentgrasses had 5 to 15 percent annual bluegrass at the end of three years.

Annual bluegrass infests almost all mature putting greens. Many biotypes look and grow differently than bentgrass, which reduces the quality of the putting green and can affect ball roll. Annual bluegrass also requires more water and chemicals than bentgrasses to keep it in green during the summer. Golf course superintendents will occasionally overseed greens with bentgrass to reduce the amount of annual bluegrass, but it doesn't always work. One study showed that planting SR7200 velvet bentgrass into a turf of 100 percent annual bluegrass resulted in as much as two-thirds of the green being converted to velvet bentgrass, one and a half to seven times better than creeping bentgrass cultivars (Henry et al., 2005). The ability to maintain velvet bentgrass on a putting green instead of annual bluegrass will reduce a golf course's input costs.

WISCONSIN RESEARCH

Textbooks state that velvet bentgrass is adapted only to New England and perhaps the Pacific Northwest. However, no studies conducted outside of these areas have been published, and the extent to which velvet bentgrasses were ever planted outside of these areas is unknown.

The few scientific studies of velvet bentgrass all have been conducted on acidic soils (pH < 7.0); consequently, conclusions have been reached that an acidic soil pH is needed to grow velvet bentgrass. Part of the reason for conducting turf research, though, is to test assumptions and find new uses for plants. Given that about one-third of U.S. golf courses are in the Midwest, with soil pH often above 7.0, we've been evaluating velvet bentgrasses in one way or another for nearly 10 years.

One of our first trials was a test of shade tolerance. Velvet bentgrass has been touted as more shade tolerant than creeping bentgrass, but no data have been published to support the claim. We partnered with golf course superintendent Scott San at Greenwood Hills Country Club in Wausau, Wis.,

to compare SR7200 velvet bentgrass to Pennncross in the shade. Those plots were planted in the early 2000s and maintained at tee height. SR7200 maintained much better turf cover and quality than Pennncross over a two-year period.

We have since constructed two putting greens at the O.J. Noer Turfgrass Research and Educational Facility in Madison, Wis., for further shade research. We're comparing newer cultivars of each species, Vesper velvet bentgrass and Tyee creeping bentgrass, both of which have received high scores in cultivar trials (NTEP, 2008; Cashel et al., 2005). The greens were planted in summer 2008 and are being maintained

The ability to maintain velvet bentgrass on a green instead of annual bluegrass will reduce input costs.

under 80 percent shade. Three levels of N fertilizer (1, 2 and 4 pounds per 1,000 square feet per year), with and without the plant growth regulator trinexapac-ethyl, are being tested.

A primary focus of our turf research program is to develop low input sustainable golf courses. We recently finished a project designed to determine the suitability of velvet bentgrass as a putting green turf with low fertilizer rates on a high pH (7.5) sand root zone. Vesper and SR7200 velvet bentgrasses were planted next to Pennncross and L-93 creeping bentgrasses in 2004. We tested three mowing heights, 0.1, 0.156 and 0.25 inches, and two N rates, 1 and 3 pounds per 1,000 square feet per year. Normally, we irrigate putting greens on sand root zones every day, with enough water to replace water used by the plants the preceding day [i.e., 100 percent evapotranspiration (ET)]. Due to the lower water use of velvet bentgrass, and the need to conduct research in advance of probable water restrictions, we only replaced 75 percent of the daily water use.

We found that 1 pound of N per 1,000 square feet on an annual basis was simply insufficient to provide acceptable quality putting green turf of any cultivar on the sand-based root zone (Koeritz and Stier, *In*

press). At 3 pounds of N per 1,000 square feet, Vesper velvet bentgrass was the only cultivar that produced acceptable quality turf. The turf quality of Vesper was best at the lowest mowing height of 0.1 inch, which is currently the benchmark of many high-end golf courses. Vesper produced twice the shoot density of creeping bentgrasses (~ 18,000 to 28,000 shoots per square foot compared to ~9,000 to 14,000 shoots of creeping bentgrass). Denser turf not only produces a better looking turf but one that is more resistant to weeds such as annual bluegrass and chickweed. One of the potential drawbacks to a dense turf can be loss of green speed. In our study, we tested

green speed every two weeks for two years, and found no difference among cultivars. Both velvet bentgrasses, particularly Vesper, had much less dollar spot disease than the creeping bentgrasses. At 0.1 inch height of cut, for example, Vesper had only 5 percent of the amount of disease seen in Pennncross and only 10 percent of the disease seen in L-93. Such extraordinary disease resistance can allow for much lower fungicide costs as the need for application is decreased.

Another trial, started in 2007, is helping us to determine if the acidity of fertilizers affects the quality of velvet bentgrass, as suggested by observations more than 70 years ago (Monteith and Welton, 1939). We planted Vesper velvet bentgrass on both a silt loam soil and a USGA sand-based root zone and have been using fertilizers representing a wide range of acidity. The pH of both soil types is about 7.5, which is considered basic, not acidic (7.0 is neutral). During the first year, we found the more acidic fertilizers sometimes produced better turf quality on the sand root zone. In the second year, however, we did not find that acidity was important. We are continuing the study through 2009 as sometimes climatic differences between years can change results, along with age of the turf. One positive result so far is that, once estab-

lished, velvet bentgrass on the soil green is able to produce high-quality turf with only 1 pound of N per 1,000 square feet. This is considered a very low N rate, and could be quite useful for golf courses seeking to reduce their fertilizer inputs.

We're extending our research into the use of velvet bentgrass for low maintenance, sustainable golf course fairways. We're planting monostands of velvet bentgrass, creeping bentgrass, fine fescues, Kentucky bluegrass and a mixture of velvet bentgrass and fine fescues. Turf will be irrigated to replace only 40 percent of water use during the summer, far lower than what is normally used to maintain creeping bentgrass or Kentucky bluegrass. All turf treatments will receive low and high N rates, with and without fungicide applications. We'll be monitoring turf quality, disease and soil moisture. We anticipate that the velvet bentgrass and fine fescue turfs will perform much better than the creeping bentgrass and Kentucky bluegrass turfs. The treat-

ment we're particularly interested in is the mixture of velvet bentgrass and fine fescues, as they both appear capable of providing good turf with few inputs, yet have different growth habits. So far it appears that velvet bentgrass can reduce the need for fertilizer, water and fungicide inputs, especially on soil-based root zones. **GCI**

John Stier, Ph.D., is a professor and chair of the Department of Horticulture at the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Literature Cited

- Brilman, L.A., and W.A. Meyer. 2000. Velvet bentgrass: Rediscovering a misunderstood turfgrass: Past mistakes have damaged an excellent species reputation. *Golf Course Mgt.* 68:70-75.
- Brilman, L.A. 2003. Velvet bentgrass (*Agrostis canina* L.). p. 201-205. In M.D. Casler and R.R. Duncan (ed.) *Turfgrass biology, genetics, and breeding*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ.
- Cashel, R.H., H. Samaranayake, T.J. Lawson, J.A. Honig, and J.A. Murphy. 2005. Traffic tolerance of bentgrass cultivars grown on a sand-based root zone.

Int. Turfgrass Soc. Res. J. 10:531-537.

DaCosta, M., and B. Huang. 2006a. Deficit irrigation effects on water use characteristics of bentgrass species. *Crop Sci.* 46:1779-1786.

DaCosta, M., and B. Huang. 2006b. Changes in carbon partitioning and accumulation patterns during drought and recovery for colonial bentgrass, creeping bentgrass, and velvet bentgrass. *J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci.* 131:484-490.

Henry, G.M., S.E. Hart, and J.A. Murphy. 2005. Overseeding bentgrass species into existing stands of annual bluegrass. *HortScience* 40:468-470.

Koeritz, E.J., and J.C. Stier. 200X. Nitrogen rate and mowing height effects on velvet and creeping bentgrasses for low input putting greens. *Crop Sci.* (accepted for publication 2 March 2008).

Monteith, J., Jr., and K. Welton. 1932. Putting tests upon bentgrasses. *Bulletin of the USGA Green Section* 12(6):224-227.

Monteith, J., Jr., and K. Welton. 1939. Fertilizer trials on demonstration gardens. *Turf Culture* 1(3):214-245.

National Turfgrass Evaluation Program (NTEP). 2008. 2003 National bentgrass test-putting green, 2004-07 data-final report. www.ntep.org (verified 13 May 2009).

In one velvet bentgrass trial, fertilizing with 3 pounds of nitrogen per 1,000 square feet (right side of photo) each year provided faster spring green-up than using only 1 pounds of nitrogen per 1,000 square feet (left side of photo).

