

## Sprayer Calibration-

(Continued from Page 10)

sprayed! Your distributor and manufacturer representative can be a great source for information about tank-mix compatibility.

In many cases physical compatibility is not an issue with tank-mixes, but one product can negatively affect the performance of another. For example, Daconil and Meridian (a white grub insecticide) are physically compatible, however; the WeatherStik found in Daconil will "stick" the active ingredient found in Meridian to the leaf surface and render it inactive.

There are also certain products that when used alone have a good turf safety, but when applied together can become phytotoxic. Once again, your distributor and manufacturer representative can be a great source of information to help you avoid any potential issues

### Recordkeeping

We, maybe better than any other agricultural industry, keep great records. However, we often miss a couple of key pieces of information that can be useful.

First, nearly all products that we apply have a lot or batch number printed on the container. These should be recorded with each application for each product. Why? In the case that there is an issue with how the product performs, most manufacturers will ask you for this information and often

*"Use this spring to take a look at your current practices and see if there is a way you can make some applications perform better this year."*

the manufacturer will store a small amount of each batch so that it can be tested for integrity should there be a performance issue.

Second, record which green, tee or fairway was sprayed first with each tank, and which fairway was sprayed last with each tank. The order of how areas were sprayed is important in evaluating product performance or non-performance. It allows you to estimate about what time a given area was sprayed in reference to weather events such as high temperature

or a surprise rainfall. It may also help you remedy a situation in which one spray tank was improperly mixed and a product was over- or under-applied. Lastly, it may assist in evaluating a sprayer mechanical problem or an issue with the applicator(s).

### Before you make your first pass

One of the most common mistakes that even veteran applicators make is to begin their first pass on the surface that they are intending to protect. As you may know, for the first 5-10 seconds each application, the sprayer is cleaning out rinsate from the last spray or blowing out air that might be in the lines. Remind yourself and your applicators to make a short pass in an inconspicuous area to move the spray solution from the back into the nozzles. Nothing is worse than to have made an otherwise perfect application, only to find out a couple weeks later that nothing was sprayed for the first 20 feet of your first pass!

Use this spring to take a look at your current practices and see if there is a way you can make some applications perform better this year.

# THE GOLD STANDARD

NOW AVAILABLE IN GREEN.

To learn more contact:

Mike Kelly, Technical Sales Specialist  
Bayer Environmental Science  
(952) 292-1966  
mike.kelly@bayercropscience.com  
Territories: MN, IA, ND, SD, NE



When it comes to course appearance, there is no trophy for second place. That's why we developed new Reserve™ Fungicide. Reserve delivers superior, broad-spectrum disease control without turf thinning that other fungicides can cause. To learn more, contact the representative above or go to [www.BackedByBayer.com/Reserve](http://www.BackedByBayer.com/Reserve).

 Bayer Environmental Science

Bayer Environmental Science, a business group of Bayer CropScience L.P., 2 T.W. Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. 1-800-331-2867. [www.BackedByBayer.com](http://www.BackedByBayer.com). Reserve is a trademark of Bayer. Not all products are registered in all states. Always read and follow label instructions carefully. ©2009 Bayer CropScience LP.



 RESERVE™

# SEALED BID AUCTION

All proceeds will be donated to The First Tee Programs of Minnesota



## **The First Tee Mission Statement**

To impact the lives of young people by providing learning facilities and educational programs that promote character development and life-enhancing values through the game of golf.

### THE FIRST TEE NINE CORE VALUES

- HONESTY
- INTEGRITY
- SPORTSMANSHIP
- CONFIDENCE
- PERSERVERANCE
- RESPONSIBILITY
- JUDGEMENT
- COURTESY
- RESPECT

## Toro Greensmaster® 3150



Mower donated by The Toro Company and MTI Distributing, Inc.

SEALED BIDS WILL BE ACCEPTED UNTIL NOON ON  
FRIDAY, APRIL 23, 2010

Contact your MTI Distributing Sales Representative  
for bidding instructions.



MTI Distributing, Inc.  
4830 Azelia Avenue N.  
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429  
800-362-3665  
763-592-5600  
Fax: 763-592-5700

MTI Distributing, Inc.  
2131 16th St. N. Suite C  
Fargo, ND 58102  
800-782-1031  
701-281-0775  
Fax: 701-281-9417



**Count on it.**

**TORO OFFERS A COMPLETE LINE OF HIGH PERFORMANCE AERATORS TO HELP YOU GET THE BENEFITS YOU WANT, WHILE MAXIMIZING YOUR PRODUCTIVITY.**

**Greens and Tees:** One of the smallest areas on your course has the biggest impact on your business. Make sure to keep your greens and tees in top health using one of Toro's coring or water injection aerators. Toro aerators have long been considered the leaders in greens aeration with superior hole quality, durability and productivity. The **ProCore® 648** core aerates to as deep as 4 inches.



**Fairway:** Give fairways and other large turf areas the same quality aeration as the greens. For large areas where time and productivity matter. Toro has aerators for all areas of your golf course.



The **ProCore® 864** features a 64" coring width that can aerate up to 1.5 acres per hour.



The **ProCore® 1298** can aerate up to 2.3 acres per hour with a 98" coring width and dual coring heads.



**Deep-Tine:** The **ProCore® SR Series** deep-tine aerators are ideal for aerating all areas of your course, effortlessly relieving compacted soil. The deep-tine aerators vary in width from 54" to 72" and in depth capability from 1" to 16" allowing you to perform any aeration task.

The **Toro ProCore Processor** is the newest innovation to be added to our cultivation product line. Designed for large turf areas, the innovative ProCore Processor sweeps, processes and disperses aeration cores in one, quick operation. This efficient feature helps return the course to a playable condition in substantially less time, and with less stress to the turf, the equipment operator and the superintendent.



MTI Distributing, Inc.  
4830 Azelia Avenue N.  
Brooklyn Center, MN 55429  
800-362-3665  
763-592-5600  
Fax: 763-592-5700

MTI Distributing, Inc.  
2131 16th St. N. Suite C  
Fargo, ND 58102  
800-782-1031  
701-281-0775  
Fax: 701-281-9417



**Count on it.**

## Turf Bowl Team at the U of M, Crookston Finishes 7th out of 67 Teams in National Competition



Gregg Breningmeyer, John Deere Golf, director of Sales and Marketing; Kristina S. Walker, Ph.D., advisor and lecturer in golf and turf management at the U of M, Crookston; Philp Holland; Weston Wander; Mark Michalski; Tom Halver, and Mark Kuhns, GCSAA president.

The University of Minnesota, Crookston Turf Bowl Team placed seventh in the National Turf Bowl Competition held recently. Members of the team included Junior Tom Halver, Chaska, Minn.; Senior Philip Holland, New London, Minn.; Senior Mark Michalski, Silver Bay, Minn.; and Senior Weston Wander, Sauk Centre, Minn. They competed against 67 turf bowl teams from universities all across the United States. The competition was held during the Golf Course Superintendents Association of America Education and Trade Show on February 11, 2010, in San Diego, Calif.

Out of the 31 universities who competed, the U of M, Crookston Turf Bowl Team ranked fifth behind some major turfgrass programs including Iowa State University located in Ames; University of Massachusetts in Amherst; Purdue University in West Lafayette, Ind., and Penn State located in State College.

The 3 fi-hour turf bowl exam is comprised of nine sections including identification (turfgrass, seed, soil, weed, insect and disease), turfgrass growth and development, soil and soil fertility, weed management, disease management, insect management, turfgrass calculations, business management and a case study essay.

Tom Halver, a golf and turf management major, interned for Superintendent Michael Cohrs at the Bluff Creek Golf Course in Chaska. Philip Holland interned for Superintendent John Kelley, Jr., at the Kittansett Club in Marion, Mass. Mark Michalski interned for Superintendent Roger Stewart at TPC Twin Cities in Blaine, Minn., during summer 2009. Weston Wander interned last summer for Superintendent Lee Mahnke at the Greystone Golf Club in Sauk Centre, Minn. Holland, Michalski and Wander are all pursuing double majors in golf and turf management and horticulture with an emphasis in environmental landscaping.

The advisor of the U of M, Crookston Turf Bowl Team is Kristina S. Walker, Ph.D. She earned her doctoral and master's degrees in agronomy specializing in turfgrass management from Purdue University. Walker has been teaching courses in agronomy and turfgrass management since January 2009 at the Crookston Campus.

# PENNCROSS SOD & Dominant X-treme 7 *from Country Club Turf*

Grown by  
**GOLF COURSE  
PROFESSIONALS**

for  
**GOLF COURSE  
PROFESSIONALS**



Supplying over 200  
Golf Courses Since 1987

24317 Durant St. N.E.  
East Bethel, MN 55005

**(763) 444-6753**

*"A Quality Grown Reputation"*

# Turf's Carbon Footprint: What Size Is It?

By VAN CLINE, Ph.D.  
The Toro Company

There is a growing public discussion about the environmental footprint of urban landscapes, particularly maintained turf including golf courses, sports fields, home lawns and city parks. Water use, chemical use and now greenhouse gas emissions are all being scrutinized. Much of this discussion has been sparked by careless interpretations of scientific research by the popular media. Research continues to show that efficiently managed turf grass is an environmental asset in all respects including a net sequesterer of carbon.

This article is a commentary on turf's "carbon footprint" based on a research paper published on Jan. 22, 2010, in Geophysical Research Letters, a scientific journal of the American Geophysical Union. The paper titled, "Carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions in urban turf" was authored by two postdoctoral researchers in the Dept. of Earth System Science at the University of California Irvine. The paper which attempted to quantify the carbon balance of maintained turf contained an unfortunate math error that skewed the author's conclusions and resulted in misleading stories released to the public through a number of media outlets characterizing maintained turf as a detriment to the environment.

First, some background in the science of carbon flux in turf-grass systems. Turfgrass plants capture carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) from the atmosphere and convert it to carbohydrates and ultimately to plant tissue through the process of photosynthesis. As plant tissues die and are decomposed by micro-organisms a portion of the carbon tied up in the tissue is stored or "sequestered" in the soil as stable soil organic carbon (SOC). As a result, soil becomes a "sink" for carbon derived from plant tissue that originated as atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. This is a good thing. At the same time, however, greenhouse gases (GHG) including CO<sub>2</sub> and nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) are emitted to the atmosphere in the process of maintaining turf. Mowers and other equipment burn gas and diesel releasing CO<sub>2</sub>. Electricity used in turf irrigation results in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions during its production in coal or petroleum-fired power plants. When fertilizers are applied to turf, a certain amount of the nitrogen is converted by natural microbial processes into N<sub>2</sub>O which is lost to the atmosphere. N<sub>2</sub>O is a powerful greenhouse gas. Turf maintenance as a result is a source of greenhouse gases. The question then is whether the amount of carbon sequestered by the turf system and stored in the soil exceeds the CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emitted back into the atmosphere during routine maintenance.

## UC Irvine Study Objective

The objective of the UC Irvine study was to quantify greenhouse gas (GHG) contributions from turf maintenance based on city parks in Irvine, CA, in order to calculate a net "global warming potential" (GWP) balance between soil carbon sequestered and GHG's emitted in turf maintenance.

## Study Background

1. The study was based on turf maintenance practices for city parks in Irvine, CA.
2. General park turf and sports field turf were considered separately.
3. Soil organic carbon and N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were measured on-site from four parks built at different times between 1975 and 2006, and within a 4.4 mile radius. These two factors were the only data collected directly by the scientists.
4. CO<sub>2</sub> produced in electricity generation for irrigation pumping was estimated using previously published data from agricultural irrigation research. Specific water use rates and irrigation practices for turf in Irvine parks were not considered.
5. CO<sub>2</sub> from fuel consumed in turf maintenance was calculated from data given to the scientists by the Irvine park maintenance contractor. Fuel used was reported as a monthly average

(Continued on Page 16)

**Mix Better!**

with

**CLEANLOAD™**



**Spray Better!**

with

**GuardianAIR™  
TWIN**



**Use Technology to Improve Your Applications!**

Find out more from

**Frost**  
Services

612-616-2876  
frostservices@frontier.com  
www.frostserv.com

# Turf's Carbon Footprint-

(Continued from page 15)

only and was not broken down by maintenance activity. The scientists assumed that all fuel was used for turf maintenance. Their calculations were based on total park acreage, not turf acreage.

6. Fertilizer application rates were considered at two extremes specified by the City of Irvine: 2 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr and 15 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr. The assumption was that the 2 lb. rate was used on general park turf, and the 15 lb. rate on sports fields.

7. CO<sub>2</sub> produced in fertilizer manufacturing was estimated using previously published data and was calculated for the 2 lb. and 15 lb. fertilizer rates.

## Original Study Conclusions:

1. General park turf sequestered carbon over time based on a linear trend in soil carbon data from the four Irvine parks of different ages.

2. No carbon was sequestered in sports field soils based on what the scientists concluded to be a lack of a trend in soil carbon data.

3. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion dominated turf's net contribution to GWP according to the scientists original calculations.

4. N<sub>2</sub>O emissions were influenced strongly by fertilizer application rates (2 lb. N and 15 lb. N).

5. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fertilizer manufacturing represented a significant GHG contribution.

6. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from electricity generation for irrigation pumping also represented a significant GHG contribution.

## Analysis & Critique by Toro:

1. Based on Toro fuel use research the study's reported fuel contribution to GWP appeared to be very high. Recalculating the study's results using the data presented in the paper revealed a 12X error (conversion error from month to annual) in the study's results which was acknowledged by the authors. (The authors have submitted a correction to Geophysical Research Letters for publication.) Toro calculations indicated a 92% reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from fuel combustion. This correction alone indicated a significant net sequestration of carbon in general park turf. (see Figure 1)

2. We recalculated fuel use based on Toro research data, which more accurately represented actual fuel use for turf maintenance, and a turf acreage estimate of 60% of total park area which reduced the CO<sub>2</sub> emission estimate for fuel use an additional 11%.

3. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions in electricity generation for irrigation pumping were recalculated based on turf water use reflecting ET for Irvine's climate during the study period, and energy calculations reflecting basic pumping physics which resulted in a 24% reduction in the CO<sub>2</sub> emissions estimate for irrigation.


4. Based on the SOC data presented in the study for sports turf, we concluded that there was an apparent trend in carbon sequestered over time even though the trend was less predictable than for general park turf. We estimated the carbon sequestered in sports field soils in this study to be approximately half that in general turf soils. Specific data for an accurate calculation was not available in the paper, however.

5. The 15 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr fertilizer rate was unreasonably high. The turfgrass extension specialists at the University of

(Continued on Page 17)

**Figure 1:**  
**Carbon sequestered vs. GHG's emitted in park turf maintenance in Irvine, CA**

Townsend-Small, A. and C.I. Czerniczak: 2010 Carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas emissions in urban turf. Geophysical Research Letters, vol. 37.  
UC Irvine Dept. of Earth Systems Science



**Figure 1:**

#1 Original UC Irvine calculations with fuel error

#2 UC Irvine calculations with only fuel corrected

#3 Calculations with fuel use adjusted based on Toro data, and electricity use for irrigation adjusted based on Irvine ET

\* Global Warming Potential (GWP) is expressed as grams of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emitted or sequestered per square meter of turf per year

# Turf's Carbon Footprint-

(Continued from Page 16)

California Riverside recommend 4 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr for both cool and warm season lawn and park turfs. We, therefore, calculated CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O emission impacts using 4, 6 and 8 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr in addition to the 2 lb. N rate to elucidate net GWP results at different fertilizer rates. Using the SOC value for general park turf the net zero GWP would occur at 6-8 lb N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr. (see Figure 2)

## Lessons from this experience

The authors and the University continue to stand by the conclusion that turf is an "unlikely" sink for GHG's based on their range of results for management using 2 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr and 15 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr. At 2 lb. N their corrected results show a significant net sink or benefit. At 15 lb. N the results show turf to be a large emitter. Their study did not examine controlled applications of fertilizers. They simply used the range given to them by the City of Irvine. But, because of the results for 15 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr, they concluded that it is "unlikely" that turf can be a net sequesterer of carbon because of the emissions produced at this high rate. The flaw in their logic of course is that 15 lb. of nitrogen for that climate is an irresponsible use of fertilizer! No one experienced in turf management would promote the use of 15 lb. of nitrogen. Again, the turfgrass extension specialists at UC Riverside recommend the application of 4 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr for both cool and warm season lawn and park turfs. The published conclusion that it is "unlikely" that turf is a net sink for carbon is based on an unreasonable assumption for nitrogen fertilization. There are two important lessons here: first, turf managed responsibly is a net sequesterer of carbon; second, researchers lacking expertise in a specific discipline should learn about the subject being studied and should validate their assumptions with experts before publishing broad conclusions.

It is worth noting that the UC Irvine scientists apparently had limited background in research related to cropping systems including turf, and that the journal, Geophysical Research Letters, does not normally publish research in this area. Not only did the authors miss the fuel

Figure 2: Carbon sequestered vs. GHG's emitted at different fertilizer rates in park turf maintenance in Irvine, CA




Figure 2: #1 UC Irvine calculations with only fuel corrected; #2 UC Irvine calculations with fuel use adjusted based on Toro data, and electricity use for irrigation adjusted based on Irvine ET; #3 Calculations with fuel use adjusted based on Toro data, and electricity use for irrigation adjusted based on Irvine ET at additional fertilizer rates. \* Global Warming Potential (GWP) is expressed as grams of CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent emitted or sequestered per square meter of turf per year

error, but the journal reviewers failed to question the extent of the fuel contribution to emissions as well. They also failed to question the appropriateness of the 15 lb. N/1000ft<sup>2</sup>/yr. fertilizer application rate, and failed to recognize the need for more specific water use rates for turf in Irvine, CA. This raises a question about expertise. Scientists better versed in agronomy publishing in a journal focused on agricultural or horticultural topics would have produced a different outcome.

This study illustrates the danger in translating results from research conducted under a specific set of conditions and in a specific climate to all situations in all climates. In the case of this study, we would all expect that results in Minnesota or Florida would likely differ from results in Irvine, CA. The turf system is complex. The authors may not have intended their conclusions to be generalized, but without being specific in their communications with the media they were.

There is also a lesson in the use of generalized assumptions to make specific calculations. The UC Irvine study only measured soil organic carbon and nitrous oxide evolution. Calculations of emissions from fuel use for mowing, electricity use in irrigation and fertilizer manufacturing which make up the bulk of the GHG emissions were based on previously published information or general estimates in the case of fuel and fertilizer use. Based on our knowledge of turf management, the water and fuel inputs were overstated in the

study. "Information out" is only as good as "information in." When drawing important conclusions it is important to know that your data is as good as it can be. Studies like this should measure actual inputs under best management practices if the objective is to measure carbon sequestration potential.

An issue that requires serious discussion as the industry clarifies turf's carbon footprint is what emission costs can or should logically be assigned to turf management on a specific site. In other words, how far down the production chain should the environmental impact be counted in the calculation of a footprint? In this study, CO<sub>2</sub> resulting from fertilizer manufacturing was included. Should it be? If the answer is yes, then should CO<sub>2</sub> from manufacturing the turf maintenance equipment be included? If that answer is yes, should CO<sub>2</sub> from mining the iron ore to produce the steel to manufacture the equipment be included? Should the CO<sub>2</sub> from mining the coal to produce the electricity to pump the irrigation water be included? The point is that fair boundaries need to be established in assigning greenhouse gas emission costs whether it's turf management or any other commercial endeavor.

Turfgrass' carbon footprint is an emerging issue that warrants serious research. There are many biological

(Continued on Page 19)

**JACOBSEN**  
A Textron Company



- Energy and Economics - Features a hybrid or battery powered system that is simpler, faster and less expensive to operate and maintain.
- Comfort and Confidence - Maximize your operators potential with an ergonomic design that keeps controls comfortably within reach and the view unobstructed.
- Versatility and Value - Numerous attachments available including the Turf Groomer®, Quick Roll™ attachment and a variety of rollers for the best playing conditions.
- Tradition and Trust - Uses Jacobsen Classic XP reels, trusted for the highest quality-of-cut at the top courses around the world.
- Respectful and Responsible - No hydraulic oil to leak or change coupled with significantly reduced noise and exhaust emissions make the Eclipse 322 an environmental champion.



- The ONLY walking greens mowers with variable frequency of cut - for the finest quality cut in any conditions.
- The ONLY walking greens mowers with onboard backlapping - to quickly and easily maintain a superior quality of cut.
- The ONLY walking greens mower with a fully isolation-mounted engine, which dramatically reduces operator fatigue and excess vibration on the turf, resulting in a better, more consistent cut - day in and day out.
- The ONLY walking greens mowers available in hybrid or battery drive, providing power, economy and low environmental impact.
- ONLY the Eclipse™ allows for quick and easy reel removal - simply pull three pins, unhook the crossbar and unplug the electrical motor connection. This allows operators to easily mow two different heights of cut with one machine.

# TurfWerks

**2905 Lexington Ave. S Suite 2  
Eagan, MN**

**800-592-9513  
www.turfwerks.com**

**Territory Managers:**

Tom Fuller	612-802-3149	tfuller@turfwerks.com
Greg Bondy	612-308-0102	gbondy@turfwerks.com
Mitch Stewart	515-240-8874	mstewart@turfwerks.com
Eric Nielsen	605-202-1699	enielsen@turfwerks.com
Rich Vining	605-201-2971	rvining@turfwerks.com

**Parts Manager:**

Mark Anderson	605-336-1873	manderson@turfwerks.com
---------------	--------------	-------------------------



## Musing the Minutes

By MATT McKINNON  
MGCSA Secretary



The MGCSA Board met at Golden Valley Golf and Country Club on March 9, 2010.

Treasurer Paul Eckholm, CGCS, reported that projections for this year are on track. The Board needs to look at committee budgets and report any changes for the year at the next meeting.

There also was some discussion if we should send out the *Hole Notes* publication electronically and possibly reduce it down to six times per year. MGCSA board will need to survey the membership before anything could possibly be done.

Scott Turtinen reported that the Hospitality night in San Diego made \$1,000 profit this year. The March Mega Seminar made \$4,300 but there are some travel expenses that still have to be paid. The March Mega Seminar had 78 attendees on Wednesday and 98 on Thursday. Fifty-eight people signed up for both days. MGCSA dues are coming in. We have received 416 paid Superintendents and 186 have not paid. Affiliates have 88 paid and 44 have not. MGCSA has received \$2,600 from the dues for Research.

Eric Counselman and Jeff Ische reported that they are working on the 2011 Green Expo. For the 2011 Expo there will only be eight sessions offered where we have had more in the past. On Thursday

MGCSA will have one additional session, which was not offered to the other Associations. The 2010 Green Expo was down 20% from the eight-year average. MGCSA was down 6% from the eight-year average, and the Vendors were down 12% from the average.

Paul Diegnau, CGCS and Jeff Ische reported that Dave Oberle is the new Vice President of the MTGF and Brian Horgan is the Secretary. Since Kathy Aro is no longer with MTGF, Turtinen Communications, Inc. will take on some administrative responsibilities. MNLA will also take on some responsibilities.

Scottie Hines, CGCS reported that the MGCSA would continue to advertise for the Turf Tourney. Since we have started advertising for this event participation has increased. Since attendance was down at the Expo the MTGF has less money to give out. The Research Committee recommended that the MGCSA donate \$25,000 to the TROE Center and the TROE Center may need some more help before the year is over.

I hope everyone's spring has gotten off to a good start. As I look outside on March 15th it has been a few years since we have had almost zero snow cover in Brainerd.

- Respectfully Submitted,  
Matt McKinnon, Secretary

## Turf's Carbon Footprint-

(Continued from Page 17)

components (plants and soils) as well as management components that are not well understood. Further research is needed in several areas including:

- The potential for sequestration is influenced by soil conditions, climate, turf species, management practices and turf use. The influence of these factors on carbon dynamics needs to be sorted out. A range of locations across the U.S. should be studied to understand the influence of geography on carbon dynamics in turf management as well.

- Methodologies that accurately measure resource inputs and gases emitted in management need to be refined to deter the use of borrowed and unrepresentative estimates.

- Machine choices and management practices that influence fuel consumption must be studied and improved.

- Ultimately research must define best management practices for specific climate and soil conditions, turf species and uses that maximize carbon sequestered for the most efficient use of irrigation, nutrients, chemicals and fuels.

Turfgrass is an important component of our landscape. It is an environmental asset at many levels. Life without turf for sports, relaxation, environmental cleansing and stabilization is hard to imagine. Our responsibility is to make turfgrass the strongest contributor to environmental quality and sustainability that it can be. We have momentum. We need to keep pushing.

## LEITNER COMPANY

*Specializing in Soils for Golf Course Maintenance & Construction*

*Soil mixing and processing specialists.*

*Supplying the Golf Course Industry with soil and sand products for over 60 years.*

*Material to specification for topdressing and construction.*

*Quality - Reliability - Experience*

MIKE LEITNER  
**LEITNER COMPANY**

945 Randolph Avenue, St. Paul, MN 55102

**(651) 291-2655**

**PROUD SUPPORTER OF RESEARCH AND EDUCATION THROUGH THE MGCSA**

# PEER-TO-PEER: BETTER TURF THROUGH NETWORKING

*MGCSA members were asked:  
Considering the incredible snow mold pressure we've experienced  
this past winter ... what worked well for you?*

**In Crosslake**, there are no pictures to show, because we had no snow mold on our greens (the only place I spray for snow mold). Tank mixed labeled rates of chlorothalinalol, Iprodione, PCNB, and Propiconazole. Applied mid-November. Max snow depth was 18" this winter. Greens were free of snow by March 13. Lots of vole damage to fairways, just looks bad early in the season but does not kill the grass. I would say there were 10 times the number of voles this year compared to any other year I can remember.

- Mike Stone  
Crosswoods Golf Course  
Crosslake

**At St. Cloud Country Club:** 10 oz pcnb Fairways, - Greens = 8 oz pcnb + 6 oz daconil + 4 oz chipco. tees 8 oz pcnb + 6 oz daconil. Absolutely clean.

- Dan Hanson  
St. Cloud Country Club

**At Birnamwood**, we used Instrata at 11 oz on November 2 and then put down 6 oz of PCNB on Dec 2. No snow mold anywhere that was sprayed.

- Dan Hill  
Birnamwood Golf Course  
Burnsville

**At Somerset**, we used 9 oz/thousand of Instrata on tees and greens. Some of our tees are a little wider than our sprayer so you can see how well the fungicide

worked.

On fairways we used 7.5 ounces/thousand of PCNB followed (two weeks later) with an application of either Daconil or Chipco at labeled snow mold rates.

We came through fairly well except where the sprayer may have missed a spot. Whatever worked for you this year should be the ticket.

- James Bade  
Somerset Country Club  
Mendota Heights

**At Owatonna**, I found that any Turf treated with Instrata suffered very little Snow Mold Damage.

- Steven A. Van Natta CGCS, CPH  
Owatonna Country Club

For tees and greens at **Bluff Creek** we were at 8 oz PCNB, 4 oz Iprodione, 5 oz chlorothalonil. No signs of snow mold.

For fairways we were at 9.5 oz PCNB only and had a large amount of breakthrough in the lower wetter areas.

- Mike Cohrs  
Bluff Creek Golf Course  
Chaska

**At the Meadows**, we applied Instrata @ 9 oz / m ft 2 to our fairways and 11 oz / m ft 2 to our greens and tees the 2nd week of November last Fall. All bentgrass turf is free of snowmold this Spring except one small area on the third fairway that was missed during last Fall's application,

which was covered with snowmold after the snow melt. Instrata has worked extremely well for us the past 5 years.

- Pete Nolan  
The Meadows at Mystic Lake  
Prior Lake



## SPOONER GOLF CLUB

Above, you can clearly see where the remainder in the spray tank was sprayed out on rough. The other photo is a forward tee box that was inadvertently left untreated.

**At Spooner**, I saw excellent protection on greens and tees with Instrata at 11oz./1000. Slight to moderate breakout on fairways with PCNB at 10oz. and Daconil at 5.5oz. I also made a granular application of Fungicide IX (chloroneb) to greens at 1.9lbs/1000 as soon as the snow melted. In the above photos, you can clearly see where the remainder in the spray tank was sprayed out on rough. The other photo is a forward tee box that was inadvertently left untreated.

- Eric Ritter  
Spooners Golf Club  
Spooners, WI



Somerset Country Club's tee is getting checked out.

(Continued on Page 21)