SPORTS TURF MANAGER
Volume 18, Issue 1, ISSN 1201-3765

is the official publication of the
SPORTS TURF ASSOCIATION OF ONTARIO
328 Victoria Road South, Guelph, ON N1H 6H8
Tel: (519) 763-9431, Fax: (519) 766-1704
E-mail: info@sportsturfassociation.com
Web: www.sportsturfassociation.com

SPORTS TURF MANAGER
is published quarterly by the STA for free distribution to its membership. An annual subscription may be obtained for $40/year. Please direct advertising inquiries to Lee Huether at the STA office.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE
Jane Arnett-Rivers, Andrew Gaydon,
Lee Huether and Paul Turner

PUBLISHER
New Paradigm Communications
R.R. #8, Owen Sound, ON N4K 5W4
Tel. (519) 371-6818, Fax: (519) 371-5789
E-mail: joy@npc-solutions.com

CANADA POST PUBLICATIONS MAIL
SALES AGREEMENT No. 1461370
Postmaster: Please return undeliverable copies to the STA at 328 Victoria Rd. South, Guelph, ON N1H 6H8.

SPORTS STA TURF ASSOCIATION

STA OFFICE HOURS
Lee Huether is in the office from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Tuesday through Friday. The office phone number is (519) 763-9431. At other times, a message may be left on the voice mail system. Please include the vital information of name, telephone number with area code, and time of calling. The office may be reached at any time by faxing (519) 766-1704 or via e-mail.

The President's Desk

ANDREW GAYDON

A Spring Welcome...

It has definitely been an interesting winter weather-wise! During the early part of February, the east end of Lake Ontario froze over completely for the first time in about 20 years due to a combination of very calm water and a few extremely cold days. The ice, of course, is now long gone now but it was very interesting to view at the time.

The Landscape Ontario Congress and Ontario Turfgrass Symposium were both very active shows this year and the chatter and responses heard from the many visitors and exhibitors is that Spring 2005 is going to be very busy for our industry.

Shows and exhibitions of all types these days are no longer simply places to just display and sell ones products and services. Decades ago, a 'show' was often a local function and the surrounding businesses and farmers all arrived, usually with their families in tow, for a great day out. It was an opportunity to kick tires, ask prices and discuss what was new for the season. It was a highly social event, a chance to meet most neighbours and friends in the span of one or two days.

Now shows tend primarily to be educational forums with the exhibition being the side attraction. We are all so hungry for information, partly because it is so important for the efficient operation of our business or responsibility but also because there is so much 'stuff' today for us to absorb, review and understand that we have to be efficient information sieves. Sales and service representatives of all types of companies and organizations have to be highly informed in ever-changing markets to ensure that relevant information can be passed on in an intelligent but understandable fashion

Secondly, these educational forums are prime stages for marketing and they provide the atmosphere to: a) know your customer; b) know what your customer likes; c) know where, when and why your customer wants a product or service; and d) know what value your customer has placed on it. It is no surprise that these concepts apply to just about everything today whether it's business, customer service or just our own family relationships.

The reason I mention this is that as the Board of Directors of your Association, we are very aware of the importance of 'knowing our customers' (the members) and that we therefore adapt our actions, plans and the future to benefit all concerned.

We are now well into a new year and invoices for membership fees will be mailed this month. Thank you for remitting your dues in a timely manner. We accept American Express, MasterCard and Visa for your convenience.

If any members would like to participate more fully in our Association, such as volunteering on the Field Day Committee or the Newsletter Group, please put your name forward. You will be most welcomed.

Finally, the Sports Turf Association website is a great member resource and Lee, our Executive Manager, and Rob, our Webmaster, do an outstanding job keeping it current and interesting. Suggestions, of course, are always encouraged.

From all of us here, to all of you out there – have a great spring and think sunshine! ♦

Rising Prices in Irrigation and Construction

SO FAR THE IMPACT IN HAS BEEN FAIRLY WELL CUSHIONED IN CANADA

Prices of a variety of raw materials have risen at an alarming rate over the last few months. If the material is Canadian, impact has been less dramatic. The fall of the US dollar and demand from around the world, particularly the Far East, is driving up prices. Analysts also blame high-energy prices, the high demand for housing and reduced capacities among many raw material suppliers.

Here in Canada we have not yet seen this dramatic increase because the Canadian dollar (compared with the US) has improved by 10-20% over the last 9 months and this has cushioned the increase. Keep in mind that even if products are made in Canada, many raw materials necessary for manufacturing are purchased from around the world, in $US.

Rising prices for PVC, polyethylene, plastics, copper and steel are having a big impact on the construction and irrigation industries in the USA. Again, here in Canada we are seeing a less dramatic 5-15% increase. Prices of PVC, polyethylene and other types of plastics went up at the end of 2004 and are expected to continue to rise in the coming months. A resin shortage is expected to continue for the next 24 months while manufacturing catches up with demand. Volatile prices for raw materials means many producers will not quote prices more than a month out. Bear in mind that it is risky for both distributors and contractors to quote prices far in advance.

— Andrew Gaydon, Vanden Bussche Irrigation

WELCOME STA NEW MEMBERS

Gorden Horsman
City of Moncton, New Brunswick

Rick Mutuchky
Simcoe County District School Board, Midhurst, Ontario

Bruce Bourguignon
University of Alberta
Edmonton, Alberta

John Dick
Brock University
St. Catharines, Ontario

Alan Simpson
Elora, Ontario

THE GREAT CANADIAN WEATHER QUIZ...

An unprecedented ice jam on Lake Erie in 1884 caused which event?

a) record-setting floods in southwestern Ontario farmlands
b) worst Great Lakes shipping disaster in Canadian history
c) unregulated hunting of thousands of stranded white-tailed deer
d) Niagara Falls to stop flowing

Answer: d

Odds and Ends

Volunteers invited for STA Committees
Volunteers are being sought to serve as committee members on the Field Day and *Sports Turf Manager* Editorial Committees. Get involved with your association! No experience is necessary! Contact Lee at the STA office for further information.

2005 STA Membership Fees
Thank-you to all members renewing in 2005! Invoices for membership fees will be mailed at the end of March and are due on or before May 1. Please take a moment to verify your contact information as it appears on the memo accompanying your invoice. The annual STA Membership Roster is compiled from this information.

Quotable Quotes
A little Madness in the Spring is wholesome even for the King.
— Emily Dickinson (1830-1886)

A kind word is like a spring day.
— Russian Proverb

STA Membership Plaques
Display membership plaques are available in executive engraved walnut for $50 plus S&H. To order, contact Lee at the STA office.

Summer 2005 Submissions
If you have something you'd like to submit for the next issue, please forward it to the STA office by April 22, 2005.

Editorial Content
Opinions expressed in articles published in *Sports Turf Manager* are those of the author and not necessarily those of the STA, unless otherwise indicated.

Industry Press Releases

SIMPLISTIC LINES INTRODUCES NEW FIELD PAINT SERVICE AND NU-GRO LAUNCHES THEIR PROFESSIONAL WEBSITE

Simplistic Lines Inc.
Athletic Field Marking Paint Service

Simplistic Lines Inc. is the proud manufacturer and distributor of the SLW 103 athletic field painter. Due to its reliability and efficiency, this paint applicator has become a trusted field marking asset to several cities, municipalities and associations across Ontario. With turf associated sports ever increasing, the need for an efficient and productive field marking system has also increased.

It is for this reason that Simplistic Lines Inc. is now introducing a completely new athletic field marking paint service that works hand in hand with our SLW 103 athletic field painter. This service consists of a high quality pre-mixed paint that eliminates purchasing and disposal of pails, paint mixing and equipment cleaning. Our paint service has been tested by a wide range of users, and is proven to be a valuable labour, cost saving aid in all field marking operations.

For more information on how our paint service can elevate your field marking productivity, please contact us at: Simplistic Lines Inc., 519-348-0653, email info@simplisticlines.com.

Nu-Gro Professional Turf Website

The Nu-Gro Professional Turf Products Division is pleased to announce the launch of their new website for the professional turf manager! Their new site features detailed information for each of their major brands: ProTurf®, Nu-Gro® and Par Ex® for Canadian managers, and Nu-Spec® for international managers. Here, the turf manager can retrieve MSDS and Specification Sheets containing important technical information for each product. The site is located at www.nu-groturf.com. Take a look today!

Nu-Gro, Par Ex and Nu-Spec are registered trademarks of Nu-Gro IP Inc., and ProTurf is a registered trademark of OMS Investments, Inc.

Advertising Bonus

Companies who advertise regularly in the *Sports Turf Manager* have the opportunity to publish a press release (including a picture if space permits) once per year. Contact Lee Huether at the STA office for further details, email info@sportsturfassociation.com or call 519-763-9431.

Cover Story Continued: Year 2 of the Municipal IPM Lawn Demonstration Project

GEMA CHEONG, RESOURCE TECHNICIAN, ONTARIO PARKS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Study Description

The study was established in three municipal settings: Guelph, Brantford and London. At Guelph, the plots were located at the Guelph Turfgrass Institute (GTI). There were 32 plots, 9 x 5.5 m each, with a total demonstration area of 1,584 m^2. There were four management programs and they included: conventional, IPM, alternatives, and no-pesticides, see Figure 2.

At Brantford, the plots were located at the Glenhyrst Art Gallery, near the Grand River. There were three management programs and they are as follows: conventional, IPM, and no-pesticides. There were 24 plots, 7 x 5 m each, with a total demonstration area of 840 m^2, Figure 3.

In London, the plots were located at Watson Park, near the Thames River. There were 2 management programs: IPM and no-pesticides, and consisted of 16 plots, 10 x 4.5 m each, with a total demonstration area of 720 m^2, Figure 4.

Figure 2. Plot plan at the Guelph Turfgrass Institute, Guelph.

Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		Irrigated 8 cm mowing height	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides
Non-Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		**Non-Irrigated 8 cm mowing height**	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides	Conventional IPM Alternative No Pesticides

Figure 3. Plot plan at the Glenhyrst Art Gallery, Brantford.

Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		Irrigated 8 cm mowing height	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides
Non-Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		**Non-Irrigated 8 cm mowing height**	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides	Conventional IPM No Pesticides

In all three municipal settings, demonstration trials were set up on established, predominantly Kentucky bluegrass turf with an existing moderate level of weed infestation.

In all three municipal settings, the demonstration trials were set up on established, predominantly Kentucky bluegrass turf with an existing moderate level of weed infestation. The plots of each demonstration trial were divided into four lawn care management programs: conventional, IPM, alternative and no-pesticide. Within each management program, the plots were subdivided into three superimposed treatments including: fertility (2.0 kg/100 m^2 of nitrogen), mowing height (4 cm vs 8 cm) and irrigation to demonstrate the effect that these treatments have on turf quality. The amount of irrigation was based on rainfall values. However, due to the large amount of rainfall over the season and hence lack of visual turf dormancy, we were unable to demonstrate irrigation versus non-irrigation effects.

The trial started at all three locations at the beginning of June and continued until mid-November. Visual ratings and mowing were carried out weekly while the application of fertilizers, the monitoring of pests, and the application of pest control were carried out according to each of the four management programs and their superimposed treatments. A summary of the monitoring and insect sampling techniques is provided in Table 1 (pg. 8).

Results

Guelph Turfgrass Institute (GTI)

Turf Quality: Overall turf quality was highest in conventional plots, followed by IPM, alternative and no-pesticide plots,

Figure 4. Plot plan at Watson Park, London.

Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		Irrigated 8 cm mowing height	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides
Non-Irrigated 4 cm mowing height		**Non-Irrigated 8 cm mowing height**	
Fertility	**No Fertility**	**Fertility**	**No Fertility**
IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides	IPM No Pesticides

respectively. In addition, the turf quality within each management program was affected by the superimposed effect of fertility and mowing. Fertility improved turf colour, density and reduced weed population. While a higher mowing height (8 cm) improved turf density and reduced weed population.

Broadleaf weed: There was no observable reduction in percent broadleaf weed cover in both conventional and IPM plots because they had very few broadleaf weeds to start with. As to the alternative plots, a gradual reduction in weed cover has been observed throughout the season with an average reduction of 54.35%. In the no-pesticide plots, the percent weed cover was similar throughout this season, as compared to the increasing percent weed cover observed throughout last season.

Crabgrass: Crabgrass was not found in any of the plots of all four management programs. The effect of conventional, IPM and alternative programs on crabgrass control could not be examined.

Turf Insects: Both hairy chinch bug and sod webworm were not found in any of the plots of all four management programs. One grub was found in a no-pesticide plot, which is below the IPM threshold level of grubs.

Brantford

Turf Quality: Overall turf quality was highest in the conventional plots, followed by IPM and no-pesticide plots, respectively. The application of fertility and higher mowing height also improved the colour and density of the turf. The effect of fertility was particularly prominent in the no-pesticide plots, where the visual ratings were high enough to be similar to those of IPM plots. The high visual ratings of the fertilized no-pesticide plots were mainly contributed by the low percentage of broadleaf weed cover.

Broadleaf weed: Percent reduction in broadleaf weed cover was hardly observable in conventional plots because they had very few broadleaf weeds to start

Table 1. Summary of monitoring and insect sampling techniques.

Pest	Time of Monitoring	Sampling (5 samples/plot)	Threshold (0.1 m^2)	Treatment
European chafer *Rhizotrogus majalis* Japanese Beetle *Popillia japonica*	Early spring: grub damage check Late spring to summer: treat with Merit if significant damage from previous year in local area & large adult flights Late summer: if not treated, monitor & treat curatively if grubs present Fall: monitor to determine treatment success	Cup changer	> 2 per plug on irrigated turf; 0.5-1 per plug on non-irrigated	Merit
Hairy Chinch Bug *Blissus leucopterus hirtus*	Mid summer	Turf plug in bucket	> 20-25 per plug	Sevin
Sod Webworm Crambus sp. *Chrysoteuchia Topiaria*	Fall	Soap solution (30ml liquid soap in 8L water/m^2)	>6 per flush	Success
Broadleaf weeds	Early spring, late summer, late fall	grid (25 points per sample)	10-15% weed coverage/plot	Par 3
Crabgrass	Spring	grid (25 points per sample)	10-15% weed coverage/plot	Acclaim Super

with. In the IPM plots, reduction in broadleaf weed cover was observed. The no-pesticide plots showed a general reduction in broadleaf weed cover over the season and the percent broadleaf weed cover was much higher in the non-fertilized than the fertilized no-pesticide plots.

Crabgrass: Crabgrass was found in all three management programs but in numbers below the IPM threshold level of crabgrass, with the exception of one no-pesticide plot. Hence, all but one plot that contained crabgrass were spot-treated rather than broadcasted with herbicide.

Turf Insects: Hairy chinch bug, sod webworm and grubs were found in all three management programs but in numbers below their IPM threshold levels.

London

Turf Quality: Overall turf quality was higher in the IPM than the no-pesticide plots. In addition, the turf quality within both management programs was affected by the superimposed effect of fertility and mowing. The application of fertility and mowing at a higher mowing height improved the colour and increased the density of turf.

Broadleaf weed: Percent broadleaf weed cover was greatly reduced over the season in the IPM plots and remained relatively the same throughout the season in the no-pesticide plots, Figure 5.

Crabgrass: Crabgrass was found in the plots of both management programs, but in numbers below the IPM threshold level for crabgrass. Hence, all plots that contained crabgrass were spot-treated rather than broadcasted with herbicide.

Turf Insects: Hairy chinch bug, sod webworm and grubs were found in both management programs but in numbers below their IPM threshold levels.

Effect of Fertility on Broadleaf Weed Cover at all Three Locations

The application of fertilizer has been observed to improve turf quality by increasing the 'greenness' and density of turf under all four management programs. In addition, the percent broadleaf weed cover was generally lower in fertilized no-pesticide plots as compared to non-fertilized no-pesticide plots, Figure 6. Such phenomenon was observed in all fertilized no-pesticide plots located at all three municipalities in both season 1 and 2.

Overall Pesticide Reduction

The breakdown of the number of pesticide applications among the four lawn care management programs in the three municipalities is illustrated in Table 2 (pg. 10). Overall, there was a 50-66.67% reduction in the number of pesticide applications in the IPM plots as compared to conventional plots in Brantford and London. In terms of the volume of herb-

icide use, there was an overall 48.2% reduction in herbicide use in IPM plots as compared to conventional plots in Brantford and the GTI, Figure 7 (pg. 10). Only herbicide reduction was taken into consideration because turf insects were present at numbers below their IPM threshold and consequently, no insecticides were sprayed in the IPM plots. This reduction was mainly a result of spot-treating broadleaf weeds and crabgrass instead of broadcasting them with herbicide.

Educational Opportunities

Different types of communication and educational opportunities were provided by the project throughout the season. At the GTI, the Annual GTI Research Field Day was held on August 17, 2004 and approximately 75 members of the turf industry including turf managers, researchers and personnel of lawn care companies came to visit the plots and enquire about the results of the projects. The Master Gardener Training Program was also held at the GTI and about 60 gardeners visited the plots.

At Brantford, the demonstration project received press attention through an article in the *Expositor*, a local newspaper. In addition, the City of Brantford participated in the Communities in Bloom competition and juries of the competition visited the plots at Glenhyrst Art Gallery and received a detailed description of the project. Furthermore, a sign illustrating the purpose and method of the project was created and it provided information of the project to members of the public that pass by the park of the Glenhyrst Art Gallery.

Figure 5. Difference between control (left) and 4 cm fertilized IPM plot (right). London, November 3, 2004.

Figure 6. Average percent broadleaf weed cover of no-pesticide plots at the GTI in season 1 and 2.



Table 2. The total number of pesticide applications among the four lawn care maintenance programs.

Location	Treatments	Par III	Dimension	Acclaim	Sevin	Merit	Nature's Weed & Feed	Corn Gluten Meal	Total
GTI	Conventional	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
	IPM	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
	Alternative	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	5
	No Pesticide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Brantford	Conventional	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	6
	IPM	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
	No Pesticide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
London	IPM	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
	No Pesticide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Figure 7. Comparison of the volume of herbicide use in the conventional and IPM plots at Brantford and the GTI.



At London, questions regarding the project were sometimes produced by the park users of Watson Park.

Conclusions

Turf quality was highest in conventional followed by IPM, alternative and no pesticide programs. Despite the 50-66.67% reduction in the number of pesticide use or the 48.20% reduction in the volume of herbicide use in IPM plots as compared to conventional plots, the quality of the turf in IPM plots was only reduced slightly. In addition, mowing at a higher height (8 cm) improved the density of turf, while the application of fertilizer improved turf colour and density and reduced broadleaf weed cover in the no-pesticide plots. The manifestation of turfgrass insects was not an issue in any of the three municipalities. They were all present in numbers below the threshold for IPM pest control. Crabgrass infestation was also not a problem. It was only found at Brantford and London in numbers below its IPM threshold level, with the exception of one plot. As for broadleaf weed cover, a couple of trends were observed. At the GTI, the percent of broadleaf weed cover of no-pesticide plots was similar throughout season 2, as opposed to its gradual increase throughout season 1. Broadleaf weed cover of the alternative plots at the GTI reduced gradually throughout season 2, while no trend was observed in season 1. At Brantford, broadleaf weed cover of both IPM and no-pesticide plots was observed to reduce throughout the season. At London, broadleaf weed cover was much reduced in the IPM plots and remained relatively similar throughout the season in the no-pesticide plots.

In season 3, the impact of IPM, alternative and no pesticide programs on turf quality is expected to increase. We hope to examine if pest infestation and the effectiveness of pest control will change, and monitor the further development of the trends of broadleaf weed cover. The effect of irrigation on turf quality can also be examined if there is less rain in season 3. In addition, the effectiveness of Nature's Weed and Feed can be better examined if the application begins earlier in the season. In terms of educational opportunities, we hope to have open houses in all three municipalities in order to convey the purpose and results of the project to more members of the general public.

For further information regarding this project, please visit the project website at www.gti.uoguelph.ca/OPA. It contains general information, photos, presentation slides and final reports of the project

Acknowledgements

This project was funded by the Ontario Pesticides Advisory Committee and coordinated by the Guelph Turfgrass Institute. I would like to acknowledge the following people: Pam Charbonneau, OMAF; Doug Mewett, OPAC; Erica Gunn, GTI; Bruce McGauley, City of London; Dennis Wale, City of Brantford; Norm McCollum, GTI; Mark Meloun, City of Brantford; and Mark Donahue, City of London. ♦