

Water Volume Doesn't Matter...Or Does It?

By Renee Rioux, PhD Student, Department of Pathology, University of Wisconsin - Madison &
By Dr. Jim Kerns, Department of Pathology, University of Wisconsin - Madison

Editors Note: Renee Rioux is a PhD Student in Plant Pathology at the University of Wisconsin - Madison with a minor in Plant Breeding and Plant Genetics. She received her Masters Degree in Botany and Plant Pathology with Genetics concentration from the University of Maine in 2010 and her Bachelor of Science Degree from the University of Maine in 2008. Renee was awarded a Watson Fellowship from the Golf Course Superintendents Association in 2011.

College of As a PhD student in Dr. Kerns' turfgrass pathology lab, I study virtually all aspects of dollar spot, from where the pathogen is coming from, to how it infects its hosts, and even the molecular mechanisms governing host resistance. This past summer, we added another small project to my research: evaluating the effect of different water carrier volumes on fungicide efficacy for dollar spot control. This has become an increasingly popular subject in recent years because many view carrier volume as a variable that can be manipulated to optimize disease control. With the many issues complicating dollar spot management, getting the most out of available fungicides is no trivial matter. Our goal with this study is to determine

if altering carrier volume enhances the efficacy or expands the duration of dollar spot suppression provided by Chipco26GT and two relative newcomers to the market, Secure and Daconil Action.

The Study

This first of two years of this study commenced this past summer and was performed on a creeping bentgrass (cultivar 'Alpha') fairway maintained at a height of 0.5 inches at the O.J. Noer Turfgrass Research Center. All possible combinations of four water carrier volumes and six fungicide regimes were utilized as treatments and were replicated four times in a randomized complete block design (Table 1). An initial spray was put out on June 14th, 2012, at which time no active dollar spot infection centers were present. Dollar spot severity ratings were made weekly by counting the number of active infection centers present in each plot.

Fungicide reapplications were made based on a 1% spray threshold; thus, when infection centers covered greater than 1% of the area in a single plot the treatment in that plot was reapplied to all four replicate plots for the treatment. This allowed us to determine not just fungicide efficacy, but also differences in duration of control for our different

treatment regimes. Based on our 1% threshold, two reapplications were made for treatments 5 and 20, but only one reapplication was needed for all other treatments (Table 1). At the end of the trial, severity data was converted to area under the disease progress curve (AUDPC), which gives a single value for disease progress over time, and means were separated using the Waller Duncan test. We looked for effects of fungicide treatment, carrier volume, and interaction between fungicide treatment and carrier volume. The results of this year's trial are described below.

The Results

Unfortunately (or maybe fortunately for many!) the hot dry conditions we experienced this summer were not particularly conducive for dollar spot and much of this trial went without significant symptom development (Fig. 1). Around mid-July, we experienced moderate disease pressure and this resulted in the extra reapplication mentioned before for treatments 5 and 20. Following this outbreak, another hot stretch limited disease development until mid-August. Conditions around this time were highly conducive for dollar spot and all the plots got hammered, resulting in reapplication of all treatments (Fig. 1).

Based on our disease severity over time, the combination of Daconil Action and Chipco26GT or Secure provided the best suppression of dollar spot (Table 2). All other treatments, with the exception of Daconil Action alone, provided disease suppression similar to that of the Daconil Action/Chipco26GT mix. Daconil Action by itself provided poor dollar spot control across all water volumes and its performance was not statistically different from that of the non-treated controls.



Bayer Environmental Science

John M. Turner
Sr. Sales Specialist - Golf
Bayer Environmental Science

Cell Phone: (630) 215-6110
Office: (630) 443-7807
Fax: (630) 443-7839
Email: john.turner@bayercropscience.com

WISCONSIN PATHOLOGY REPORT

Table 1 Treatments for trial on the effects of carrier volume for dollar spot control

Treatment #	Fungicide(s)	Carrier Volume (gal/1000ft ²)	Rate
1	Nontreated control	0.5	
2	Nontreated control	1.0	
3	Nontreated control	1.5	
4	Nontreated control	2.0	
5	Daconil Action	0.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ²
6	Daconil Action	1.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ²
7	Daconil Action	1.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ²
8	Daconil Action	2.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ²
9	Chipco26GT	0.5	4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
10	Chipco26GT	1.0	4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
11	Chipco26GT	1.5	4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
12	Chipco26GT	2.0	4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
13	Secure	0.5	0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
14	Secure	1.0	0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
15	Secure	1.5	0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
16	Secure	2.0	0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
17	Daconil Action Chipco26GT	0.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
18	Daconil Action Chipco26GT	1.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
19	Daconil Action Chipco26GT	1.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
20	Daconil Action Chipco26GT	2.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 4 FL OZ/1000FT ²
21	Daconil Action Secure	0.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
22	Daconil Action Secure	1.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
23	Daconil Action Secure	1.5	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²
24	Daconil Action Secure	2.0	2 FL OZ/1000FT ² 0.96 FL OZ/1000FT ²

Wisconsin Turf Equipment Corp.

Established in 1956

*Deep Tine Aeration * Core Aerification Services

*Vibrating Tine Aeration / Seeding

*Reel Grinding *Tune-ups * Oil Changes

*General Maintenance * Grass Seed

Equipment Rental * Line Marking Paints * Overseeding
Custom made Hydraulic Hoses * Used & Demo'd Equipment



800-443-1840
sales@wisconsinturf.com
www.wisconsinturf.com

1306 West B-R Townline Rd. Beloit, WI 53511-9002



WISCONSIN PATHOLOGY REPORT




Figure 1. Disease severity over time. Arrows represent fungicide reapplication dates. The blue arrow represents reapplication of treatments 5 and 20 only. The black arrow represents reapplication of all fungicide treatments.




Fig. 2 Dollar spot severity across all fungicide regimes and carrier volumes

WISCONSIN PATHOLOGY REPORT

This was not a surprise, as the hot, dry conditions in Madison this summer prevented application of the fungicide until it was likely too late to truly prevent dollar spot development. It does, however, reaffirm the need to mix different active ingredients when dollar spot development is extreme. This was evident from both Chipco26GT/Daconil Action and Secure/Daconil Action performing well in our trial. When applied alone, the newest fungicide in our treatment list, Secure, also performed reasonably well when compared to the non-treated control, though not as well as when applied in combination with Daconil Action.

In this year of the study, water carrier

volume had very little effect across all of our fungicide treatments (Table 3). Consequently, no difference was detected for carrier volume or the interaction between fungicide regime and carrier volume. These results are reinforced by a comparison across all treatments and carrier volumes (Fig. 2). In general, those fungicide regimes that performed well did so across all carrier volumes and those fungicide regimes that did not perform so well also did so regardless of carrier volume.

Summary

With a single year of data and less than ideal conditions for both dollar spot devel-

opment and fungicide application, we are currently unable to make any conclusions about the influence of carrier volume on fungicide efficacy for dollar spot suppression. Though results from this year indicate a minimal influence of carrier volume, we may see a completely different trend next summer. Once we this second year of data and are able to make more informed decisions about the role of carrier volume on dollar spot suppression, we will be sure to share our findings. Hopefully, this will allow for the selection of carrier volumes that optimize the efficacy and longevity of fungicide applications for dollar spot management. ✓

Table 2 Dollar spot severity over time as affected by fungicide

Treatment	AUDPC ¹
Nontreated Control	1638.4 a
Daconil Action	1427.1 a
Chipco26GT	884.4 b
Secure	859.0 b
Daconil Action Chipco26GT	758.4 b
Daconil Action Secure	715.5 b

¹AUDPC values followed by the same letter do not differ significantly (Waller Duncan test, p=0.05)

Table 3 Dollar spot severity over time as affected by carrier volume

Carrier Volume	AUDPC ¹
0.5gal/100ft ²	1075.2 a
1.0gal/100ft ²	1048.3 a
1.5gal/100ft ²	1042.4 a
2.0gal/100ft ²	1029.8 a

¹AUDPC values followed by the same letter do not differ significantly (Waller Duncan test, p=0.05)



JOHN DEERE LANDSCAPES

Agronomic Sales

Northern Wisconsin

Steve Wasser

920-362-1809

Southern Wisconsin

Rob Wasser

262-206-0775