

# TURFGRASS TRENDS

Volume 9, Issue 1 • January 2000

## BACK TO BASICS

### Mowing Its Impact on Turfgrasses

By Richard J. Hull, University of Rhode Island

No activity is more synonymous with turf management than mowing. Turf is defined as a grass sward subjected to close regular mowing so it can serve an aesthetic or utilitarian function. The greatest single expense in maintaining a high quality turf is often the cost of mowing and mowing equipment. However, for all its importance to turf maintenance, mowing is rarely viewed as a significant management variable. To what extent can the turf manager adjust mowing frequency, height, and timing so as to maximize turf quality? This Back-To-Basics article will attempt to answer this question.

Mowing, along with fertilization and irrigation, is regarded as one of the three primary cultural practices in turf management (Turgeon 1999). However, mowing is unique in often being regarded as negative or harmful to the well-being of grass. Turgeon (1999 p. 150) states the problem as follows: "From a purely botanical standpoint, mowing is detrimental to turfgrasses. It causes a temporary cessation of root growth, reduces carbohydrate production and storage, creates ports of entry for disease-causing organisms, temporarily increases water loss from cut leaf ends, and reduces water absorption by the roots." There is evidence to support all of these negative consequences from mowing but this does not necessarily mean that a regularly scheduled partial defoliation is harmful to turf or constitutes a true stress. I will return to this argument later.

### Mowing Height and Turfgrass Morphology

Partial defoliation is nothing new to turfgrasses. Most of our grasses have come to us from open grasslands where grazing animals and wild fires regularly defoliated them. These grasses evolved under conditions of periodic defoliation and adapted by responding in a positive manner. Mowing tends to stimulate tillering and this results in a thicker turf with more shoots per square foot. Mowing also removes culms that have been induced to flower and begin to elongate. The apical meristem is removed and the culm dies so the stand remains largely vegetative as basal tillers are promoted (Hull 1998).

Some years ago, K.M. Sheffer and colleagues (1978) at Pennsylvania State University compared the morphologic responses of 62 Kentucky bluegrass cultivars to three mowing heights: 0.5, 1.0 and 2.0 inches. In general, they observed blade angles increased (leaves became more horizontal) as cutting height was lowered. However, Kentucky bluegrasses vary considerably in their leaf blade angle and the tendency toward a more horizontal leaf blade with lowered cutting height was only a few degrees. A more significant impact of mowing height was on tiller number (Fig. 1). Although for this part of the study, only a

## IN THIS ISSUE

### ■ Mowing: Its Impact on Turfgrasses . . . . . 1

Mowing Tolerance Ranges

Mowing Frequency and Turfgrass Growth

Mowing Induced Stress

Turfgrass Recovery

### ■ Soiless Sod: Use Tied to Economy, USGA Specs . . . . . 9

Drainage Considerations

Producers' Perspective

### ■ Insect Specimens: Collection & Preparation . . . . . 13

### ■ 1999 Article Index . . 14

Visit us at  
[www.landscapegroup.com](http://www.landscapegroup.com)



**Executive Editor**

Sue Gibson  
440-891-2729; 440-891-2675 (fax)  
sgibson@advanstar.com

**Managing Editor**

Bruce F. Shank, BioCOM  
805-274-0321

**Senior Science Editor**

Dr. Karl Danneberger

**Consulting Editor**

Chris Sann

**Group Editor**

Vern Henry

**Production Manager**

Karen Lenzen  
218-723-9129; 218-723-9576 (fax)  
klenzen@advanstar.com

**Circulation Manager**

Frank Christopherson  
218-723-9271

**Group Publisher**

John D. Payne  
440-891-2786; 440-891-2675 (fax)  
jpayne@advanstar.com

**Corporate & Editorial Office**

7500 Old Oak Blvd.  
Cleveland, OH 44130-3369

**New Subscriptions**

1-888-527-7008

Abstracts: 800-466-8443  
Reprint: 440-891-2744  
Permission: 440-891-2742  
Single copy or back issues:  
Subscription/Customer Service  
1-888-527-7008; (fax) 218-723-9437  
Website address:  
www.landscapegroup.com

**Chairman and Chief Executive Officer**

Robert L. Krakoff

**Vice Chairman**

James M. Alic

**VP-Finance, CFO & Secretary**

David W. Montgomery

**Executive Vice President, Business Development**

Skip Farber

**Executive Vice Presidents**

William J. Cooke  
Alexander S. DeBarr

**Vice President & General Counsel**

Eric I. Lisman

**Treasurer and Controller**

Adele D. Hartwick

few cultivars were compared, they all exhibited a marked increase in tiller density as mowing height was lowered. Some showed the greatest increase when mowing was lowered from 2 to 1 inch. Others responded more when the cutting height was decreased from 1 to 0.5 inches.

In a more recent study, Razmjoo et al. (1995) compared stand density with mowing height on 43 Kentucky bluegrass cultivars under the mild conditions of Japan. They evaluated turf responses to mowing heights of 0.4, 0.8, 1.0 and 1.6 inches over a two-year period and compared initial and final shoot density. They noted a decline in density when mowing heights were more or less than 1.0 inch. When mowed at 0.4 inches, shoot density decreased an average of 24 percent below the initial density. While this study appears to disagree with the Penn State report, the growing conditions were much warmer in Japan and stand density was determined by visual estimates rather than by actual tiller counts. Both of these factors could contribute to different results.

Turfgrasses are less tolerant of low mowing heights when subjected to stress condi-

tions: drought, high temperature, disease, etc. It is likely that the high temperatures experienced during the growing season in Japan made cool-season Kentucky bluegrass less able to maintain a dense stand when mowed at less than one inch.

Most grasses, when grown within their range of adaptation, respond to mowing height as outlined above. However, low mowing was reported not to promote increased tillering in tall fescue, but this was related to lower numbers of basal buds which limited the ability of that grass to respond to defoliation by greater tillering (Laude and Fox 1982). For this reason, tall fescue has a mowing range of 1.5 inches and higher (Table 1).

When turfgrasses are cut at heights below their tolerance range, the stand thins and weed invasion occurs. When mowed above the tolerance range, the turf often becomes puffy, tends to lie down, is more prone to disease and produces excess thatch. In general, cool-season grasses can tolerate lower mowing heights than can warm-season grasses — Bermudagrass and seashore paspalum being notable exceptions (Table 1). Differences in ranges of




Figure 1. Effect of mowing height on tiller density of four Kentucky bluegrass cultivars. (Sheffer et al, 1978).

**TABLE 1. MOWING TOLERANCE RANGES**

Turfgrass	Species	Mowing tolerance range (in)	
Creeping red fescue	<i>Festuca rubra ssp. rubra</i>	1.5-2.0*	0.5-2.0**
Chewings fescue	<i>F. rubra ssp. commutata</i>	1.5-2.0	0.5-2.0
Tall fescue	<i>F. arundinacea</i>	>1.5	1.75-3.0
Kentucky bluegrass	<i>Poa pratensis</i>	0.75-2.5	1.5-2.25
Rough bluegrass	<i>Poa trivialis</i>	0.5-1.0	-
Annual bluegrass	<i>Poa annua</i>	<1.0	-
Perennial ryegrass	<i>Lolium perenne</i>	1.5-2.0	1.5-2.0
Creeping bentgrass	<i>Agrostis palustris</i>	0.2-0.5	0.12-0.8
Colonial bentgrass	<i>Agrostis capillaris</i>	0.3-0.8	0.3-0.8
Velvet bentgrass	<i>Agrostis canina</i>	0.2-0.4	-
Bermudagrass	<i>Cynodon dactylon</i>	-	0.25-1.5
Buffalograss	<i>Buchloë dactyloides</i>	0.5-1.2	>1.0
Japanese lawnglass	<i>Zoysia japonica</i>	0.5-1.0	0.5-2.0
Bahiagrass	<i>Paspalum notatum</i>	2.5-3.5	1.5-3.0
Seashore paspalum	<i>Paspalum vaginatum</i>	0.15-0.5	0.45-2.0
St. Augustinegrass	<i>Stenotaphrum secundatum</i>	2.5-3.5	3.0-4.0
Centipedegrass	<i>Eremochloa ophiuroides</i>	1.0-2.0	1.0-3.0

\* Based on Turgeon (1999)

\*\* From Christians (1998)

mowing heights suggested by the two authors cited in Table 1 probably reflect their perception of how these grasses are utilized and what represents acceptable turf quality for those uses.

As a general rule, those turfgrasses that respond to mowing by increased tiller production will become more competitive against grasses that produce fewer tillers when cut at the same height (Danneberger, 1993, p. 123). Reporting on a study by Lush, Danneberger noted that during the heat of summer, creeping bentgrass is more competitive than annual bluegrass because, under such conditions, creeping bentgrass produces more tillers than annual bluegrass. During cooler conditions of fall and spring, annual bluegrass produces more tillers than creeping bentgrass. At those times, annual bluegrass will compete effectively and spread. When turfgrasses tolerant of a low cutting height are cut below their tolerance range, their tiller number and stand density decreases. The same is true for weedy competitors making them less competitive. This can occur on putting greens mowed below the tolerance range for creeping

bentgrass. The bentgrass suffers some stand thinning. Annual bluegrass is similarly affected and loses its competitiveness allowing the two species to coexist with neither grass increasing at the expense of the other (Danneberger 1995 p. 141).

## Mowing Frequency

The other management variable associated with mowing is frequency. The general rule-of-thumb guiding mowing frequency is to mow when no more than one-third of the vertical shoot growth will be removed (Turgeon 1999). Presumably, removing that much of the photosynthetic surface does not disrupt the energy balance of turfgrass plants so as to cause adverse physiological responses.

Mowing frequency is often dictated by the use to which turf is put rather than sound agronomic principles. Putting greens are mowed daily to maintain ball speed, not to insure a healthy resilient turf. Many utility turf areas are mowed whenever the maintenance staff can schedule it with little regard for the one-third rule. Conse-



quently such areas are sometimes managed more like a meadow, where hay is harvested three or four times per year and mowing involves almost total defoliation. Many of our better turfgrass cultivars likely will not perform well under such a mowing schedule. On the other hand, mowing more frequently than indicated by the one-third rule may result in:

1. Less root, rhizome or stolon growth
2. Increased shoot density
3. Decreased shoot growth rate
4. Reduced carbohydrate reserves
5. Greater leaf succulence

Height of cut also dictates frequency of cut. Turf maintained at a low cutting height will have to be mowed more frequently to follow the one-third rule. Conversely, greater mowing heights will permit less frequent mowing and still observe the one-third rule (Christians 1998 p. 150).

Because turfgrasses do not grow at the same rate throughout the growing season, the one-third rule dictates a variable mowing schedule: more frequently in the spring and fall and less frequently during mid-summer for cool-season grasses. The opposite pattern would apply to warm-season grasses. For this reason, most turf managers adjust their mowing schedule to accommodate the turf growth rate. Failure to do so may result in scalping the turf during the spring and excess weed invasion during the summer.

*Because turfgrasses do not grow at the same rate throughout the growing season, the one-third rule dictates a variable mowing schedule*

Year-to-year climatic variability will also influence mowing frequency. During a very dry season, as was experienced last year by most of the East and Midwest, mowing frequency could be decreased to two- or three-week intervals unless warm-season weed growth dictated more frequent mowing. During a cool, wet summer, mowing frequency might remain fairly constant if growth is maintained.

## Plant Energetics: Is Mowing a Stress?

The primary impact of mowing turf is the removal of photosynthetic leaf surface. As most authors have argued (Christians 1998; Turgeon 1999), the removal of leaf area reduces the plant's ability to capture light energy and use it to synthesize carbohydrates. These carbohydrates are then used to power shoot and root growth and provide the means to respond favorably to stress conditions. When turf is mowed, the argument continues, carbohydrate reserves are mobilized to support regrowth and this diminishes the supply of stored energy making the plants less able to tolerate stress conditions. To be sure, a lower mowing height does produce turfgrass plants that are smaller, have less root mass and in many cases appear less able to tolerate stresses. Closely mowed turf simply has less energy than turf allowed to maintain a greater leaf area and that is that. Or is it?

The classical definition of a plant stress is the imposition of any condition that causes a plant to grow less than that allowed by its genetic constitution. A casual application of that definition to mowing a turfgrass would seem to qualify mowing as a stress. Clearly, a closely mowed turfgrass will not produce the biomass that it would if it were not mowed. Therefore, mowing must constitute a stress to the grass.

Just a minute now! There is a lot less turfgrass present at any given time than there would be in an unmowed grass stand. Therefore, absolute dry matter production values cannot be compared. In some of my research, clipping yields of about 300 grams/sq-meter were obtained from Kentucky bluegrass turf mowed at ~1.75 inches. This translates into 2,679 pounds/acre/year. Forage yields of Kentucky bluegrass pastures are about 7,000 pounds/acre/year. However, the leaf area index (LAI) of an unmowed grass is about 5-7 while that of a turfgrass cut at two inches is 2.3 ft<sup>2</sup> of leaf/ft<sup>2</sup> of ground surface (Madison 1971, p. 97-98). If we assume the LAI of my Kentucky bluegrass turf is 2.0 ft<sup>2</sup> leaf/ft<sup>2</sup> ground while that of

unmowed grass is 6.0 (a 3X difference) than the yield per leaf surface of the turf is 1,340 lbs/acre leaf/year while that of unmowed grass is 1,167 lbs/acre leaf/year. In other words, the closely mowed turf produced 15 percent more dry matter on a leaf area basis than the unmowed grass. I realize that no provision was made in this analysis for shading of lower leaves in the unmowed grass. However, I also did not consider the yield of that grass to be based on two or three harvests, so the forage grass was mowed and regrew two or three times and leaf shading was not a constant factor. The point is that frequent mowing of a turfgrass does not markedly reduce its productivity below that of a less frequently mowed grass.

To test the extent to which turfgrasses are stressed by a routine mowing, we conducted a field experiment in which Kentucky bluegrass turf was exposed to  $^{14}\text{C}$ -labeled  $\text{CO}_2$  at 2, 24 or 72 hours following mowing. This enabled us to determine by how much current photosynthetic product was diverted away from roots and stem bases to support regrowth after mowing (Hull 1987). The data summarized in Table 2 show that the percent of current photosynthate retained in leaves (including newly expanding leaves) was only 6 percent

greater two hours after mowing than it was 72 hours after mowing. When plants were harvested 24 hours after exposing the turf to  $^{14}\text{CO}_2$  two hours after mowing, there was no detectable difference in photosynthate partitioning between the first 24 hours after mowing and the fourth day after mowing. This experiment was conducted during late spring, summer and early fall on two Kentucky bluegrass cultivars and, except for minor variations, the impact of mowing never produced a marked change in photosynthate partitioning. We conclude that a regularly scheduled mowing does not impose any significant stress to a turfgrass stand.

This conclusion requires some explanation because it defies logic. Partial defoliation must impose a stress on any plant. Normally this would be true but turfgrass plants are not grown under normal conditions. They are mowed once or twice a week. If mowed on a regular schedule, according to the one-third leaf removal rule, turfgrass plants achieve a dynamic

*Frequent mowing does not markedly reduce the productivity of a turfgrass below that of one mowed less frequently.*

**TABLE 2. PHOTOSYNTHATE DISTRIBUTION**

**Carbon-14 photosynthate distribution within Baron Kentucky bluegrass turf 2, 24 and 72 hours after a routine mowing.**

Hours after $^{14}\text{CO}_2$ exposure	Hours after mowing	Percent of recovered carbon-14 in			
		<u>Leaves</u>	<u>Stems</u>	<u>Roots</u>	<u>Rhizomes</u>
2	2	84	16	0.7	0.12
	24	80	19	0.6	0.15
	72	78	21	1.2	0.31
Significance		**	**	**	n.s.
24	2	65	33	2.2	0.22
	24	65	31	3.7	0.44
	72	67	30	2.1	0.31
Significance		n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.

From Hull (1987), \*\* Significant at  $p = <0.01$ , n.s. = not significant




Figure 2. Change in net photosynthetic rate of turf per unit leaf area in response to mowing.

equilibrium between their roots and shoots. This equilibrium is determined by the amount of photosynthetic product the plants can generate from the leaf surface retained after mowing and that which will grow until the next mowing.

Because the photosynthetic surface of each grass plant is pretty much fixed by the mowing regime, it dictates how much root growth can be supported. To be sure, root growth will be less than that produced by an unmowed plant but it will be in energetic balance with the leaf surface available. As a result of this root:shoot balance, a regular mowing places no particular stress on turfgrass plants.

Grasses have a mechanism for accommodating the modest (one-third) change in leaf surface that occurs between mowings. As illustrated in Fig. 2, after a mowing the CO<sub>2</sub> fixed by the remaining leaves increased by 10 percent over what it was 72 hours after mowing (shortly before the next mowing). This 10 percent increase in photosynthesis was achieved by two-thirds of the leaf surface that existed prior to

mowing. Therefore, the remaining leaves must have increased their photosynthetic rate by about one-third. Some of this increase was due to less leaf shading resulting from partial leaf removal. Also, some increase resulted from a greater demand on the remaining leaves for photosynthate by those parts of the plant (roots and crown tissues) that are not green and are dependent on the leaves for their energy and material needs.

Normally, when demand is not so great, photosynthate accumulates in leaves as starch or fructans and this tends to slow the rate of further photosynthetic CO<sub>2</sub> fixation. Often called product inhibition, this photosynthetic rate reduction is reversed when photosynthate withdrawal from the leaves is accelerated by increased demand from the rest of the plant. Thus, photosynthesis itself can respond to changes in plant need and apparently can compensate for any decline in photosynthetic output caused by partial defoliation.

For the reasons outlined above, it is probably wrong to view a routine mowing



as a stress imposed on turfgrass plants. On the other hand, scalping or removing more than one-third of the leaf surface or abruptly lowering the height of cut, will impose a stress on the turf. Such departures from the normal mowing routine will disrupt the energy balance between roots and shoots and the plant may be forced to draw upon storage carbohydrates. Certainly defoliation associated with forage harvesting or leaf striping by insects constitute a major stress to plants.

## Mowing and Water Use

Transpiration is the evaporative water loss from the wet cell surfaces within leaves that diffuses through the open stomates and is lost to the atmosphere. The greater the leaf surface, the more water will be lost via transpiration. Consequently, turf mowed at a greater height of cut will lose more water per day than turf maintained at a lower height (Kneebone et al. 1992). In field studies, Kentucky bluegrass mowed at heights of 1.0 and 2.0 inches transpired 15 and 27 percent more water, respectively than turf maintained at a 0.5 inch height. Most research has demonstrated a similar direct relationship between mowing height and transpirational water loss from turf.

From the above, it would appear that a lower mowing height is a good strategy for water conservation. In general, that may be true but the well being of turf must also be considered. This was best noted by Feldhake et al. (1983) who observed that Kentucky bluegrass mowed at a 2.0 inch height lost 15 percent more water than turf cut at 0.75 inches. Turf maintained at the 2.0 inch height of cut experienced very little loss in quality when irrigation was reduced by 37 percent of moisture deficit compared to well watered turf. However, the 0.75 inch turf declined sharply in quality when irrigation was reduced by 27 percent of deficit. Apparently, the shallower root system of the more closely mowed turf could not obtain sufficient water under moisture deficit conditions and excessive leaf heating resulted in injury.

Turf normally will respond to moisture shortage by allocating more photosynthate to roots, producing a deeper root system

that can capture more water and forestall moisture stress. The closely mowed turf having a smaller root system was less able to respond appropriately to impending drought and suffered greater injury.

If water conservation is an important element in a turf management program, a balance must be struck between reducing water use by lowering mowing height or accepting a greater water use rate by maintaining a higher cutting height while being able to practice a deficit irrigation strategy. The latter approach will probably conserve more water.

A modest increase in transpiration has been noted immediately following mowing (Kneebone et al. 1992) due to water loss from injured cells at the cut ends of leaves. This can be aggravated if a dull mowing blades are used. This additional water loss can be significant if turf is mowed frequently, as on putting greens, but not very important when turf is mowed once each week or less.

Turfgrass cultivars that have a more horizontal leaf angle and aggressive prostrate growth habit, will transpire less than those exhibiting more upright growth. Such grasses maintain higher humidity within the turf canopy thereby reducing the transpiration rate. Such grasses will experience little change in transpiration by lowering cutting height and thus are better adapted to areas of low humidity and high evaporative demand.

## Management Considerations

Clipping removal is essential on putting greens and other turf areas where surface quality is important. However, in most situations, clippings can be retained on the turf. They will cause no problems with air circulation or leaf shading if mowing frequency follows the one-third rule and grass is not cut when wet. There is no evidence that clippings contribute to thatch accu-

*Turfgrass cultivars that have a more horizontal leaf angle and aggressive, prostrate growth habit will transpire less than those exhibiting upright growth.*

mulation. Rather, clippings can return to the turf about one-third of their annual nitrogen requirement (Starr and DeRoo 1981).

The only potential problem with clipping retention can be the spread of disease. Leaves infected with leaf spot, leaf blotch, strip smut or red thread can serve as inoculum for expanded or continued disease incidence (Schumann and Wilkinson 1992). Although there is some controversy over the importance of clipping removal as a disease management strategy, most specific studies indicate that disease pressure is lowered by removing infected clippings.

One must weigh the benefits of clipping retention with the cost and possible disease decrease involved in their removal. It is probably wise to remove clippings when a foliar disease is sufficiently serious to require fungicide applications. Reducing the inoculum pressure can only improve the situation and an occasional clipping removal should cause few problems with turf nutrition or waste disposal.

From what has been determined through research and practice, it is obvious that mowing strategy can have a large impact on the quality of turf. It is important to know the height of cut tolerance range for your grasses and recognize that deviating from their range may cause a loss in turf quality or place the grass under stress. Within the tolerance range, a routine mowing probably subjects the turf to little stress, but departure from the routine may be stressful. When environmental stresses are likely, raising the mowing height is good insurance because it increases the ability of grass to respond and adapt to stressful conditions.

While mowing is a primary turf management practice, it also can be a useful tool for maintaining turf quality and avoiding injury caused by environmental and some biological stresses.

*Richard Hull is Professor of Plant Physiology in the Department of Plant Sciences at the University of Rhode Island, Kingston. His major research efforts have*

*centered on turfgrass nutrition and discovering factors controlling nutrient use efficiency in turf. He is a frequent contributor to TurfGrass Trends.*

## REFERENCES

- Christians, N. 1998. Fundamentals of Turfgrass Management. Ann Arbor Press, Chelsea, Michigan.
- Danneberger, T.K. 1995. Turfgrass Ecology and Management. G.I.E. Inc., Publishers, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Feldhake, C.M.; R.E. Danielson and J.D. Butler. 1983. Turfgrass evapotranspiration. I. Factors influencing rate in urban environments. *Agronomy Journal* 75:824-830.
- Hull, R.J. 1987. Kentucky bluegrass photosynthate partitioning following scheduled mowing. *Journal American Society for Horticultural Science* 112:829-834.
- Hull, R.J. 1998. Back to basics - How turfgrasses grow. *TurfGrass Trends* 8(5):7-12.
- Kneebone, W.R.; D.M. Kopec and C.F. Mancino. 1992. Water requirements and irrigation. p. 441-472. In D.V. Waddington; R.N. Carrow and R.C. Shearman. (Eds). *Turfgrass. Agronomy Monograph No. 32*, ASA, WI.
- Laude, H.M. and R.E. Fox. 1982. Tillering differences after close clipping in Russian wildrye and tall fescue. *Crop Science* 22:978-980.
- Madison, J.H. 1971. *Principles of Turfgrass Culture*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, NY.
- Razmjoo, K.; T. Imada; and S. Kaneko. 1995. A comparative study of the effects of mowing height on Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis* L.) cultivars. *Journal of Turfgrass Management* 1(3):33-42.
- Sheffer, K.M.; T.L. Watschke and J.M. Duich. 1978. Effect of mowing height on leaf angle, leaf number, and tiller density of 62 Kentucky bluegrasses. *Agronomy Journal* 70:686-689.
- Starr, J.L. and H.C. DeRoo. 1981. The fate of nitrogen fertilizer applied to turfgrass. *Crop Science* 21:531-536.
- Turgeon, A.J. 1999. *Turfgrass Management*, 5th Edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.



# Soiless Sod

## Use Tied to Economy, USGA Specs

By Bruce F. Shank, Managing Editor

**A**ny time you move a plant from where it was raised to its permanent location, there is a risk of soil incompatibility. No two soils are alike and differences can impact drainage and root growth. These problems complicate management of diseases and pests, drought, winterkill, traffic and more.

When turf must earn its keep every day, there is little tolerance for complications caused by incompatibility between the site soil and that imported with the sod.

### Seed Establishment to Limit Incompatibility

The obvious solution to soil incompatibility is to seed, in other words to establish the plant from the very beginning where it will serve its intended purpose. In this way, there can't possibly be a problem with an

interface developing because of incompatible soils.

As the demand for golf and sports facilities has grown, developers challenge contractors to shorten the time it takes plants to become established. Years shrink to weeks in the construction calendar and frequently, there simply is no practical way to seed a permanent site.

Golf courses superintendents maintain turf nurseries to reduce soil incompatibility problems in case repairs or renovation of greens are needed. In this way, they can seed or sprig the exact turf varieties on their course ahead of time in approximately the same soil. The nursery stock adapts to local conditions before it is put into play.

Another version of this principle is the local sod producer, who can grow varieties to meet the needs of superintendents and sports turf managers in the area. Of course,

### SOD PRODUCERS EXPLAIN SOILESS SOD

We talked with three members of the Turfgrass Producers International in three areas of the country to get a feel for their opinion on washed sod. Here's what they have to say:

#### Brian Bouchard, Kingston Turf Farms Kingston, RI

- Courses with time to establish, the money to build USGA greens and demand for specific cultivars don't use it as much
- Many turf managers aren't taught the options of washed or soiless sod
- Needs extra attention but also provides quick (two months) installation, vs. a year with seed
- Watch irrigation and fertility — adding diatomaceous earth can help
- He's working on a device to remove soil without water

#### Jeff Cole, West Coast Turf Palm Desert, CA

- Track record helps grow use of washed sod
- Good solution when there's no time to seed
- Recommends early core cultivation and top-dressing to encourage establishment
- Light weight allows long-distance shipping

#### Michael Spinks, Tifton Turf Farms Tifton, GA

- Washing often done as a service to customers
- Sales depend on economy and course's construction deadlines
- Looking for new uses and places to use washed sod
- Purity a key issue with hybrid bermudagrasses

no grower can maintain a supply of all available turfgrass cultivars. And, there is still a chance of soil differences.

Turf producers are adapting to resolve soil incompatibility problems and frequently offer contract growing to meet the exact needs of customers who plan ahead.

*After three to five years, the mat and organic matter generated by turfgrass roots will alter the content of the sand mixture. For those superintendents who don't want to take chances with incompatibility, a limited number of sod producers offer washed or soilless sod.*

often

The United States Golf Association's Green Section (USGA) provides a partial solution to compatibility problems in its specifications for greens mixes. Similar programs have been developed for sports fields, among them Prescription Athletic

Turf, HiPlay, and sand capping.

These depend largely on sand and set standards for particle size and shape. Soil labs are responding to meet the testing needs of superintendents with respect to both sand and organic matter. Sod producers have the ability to grow turf on mixes which meet or approximate the USGA specifications.

Now, when golf courses build or renovate greens, they can obtain bentgrass or bermudagrass growing in a similar rootzone soil. Of course, after three to five years, the mat and organic matter generated by turfgrass roots will alter the content of the sand mixture. For those superintendents who don't want to take chances with incompatibility, a limited number of sod producers offer washed or soilless sod.

### **From the Sod Producers' Perspective**

So why aren't more architects and superintendents turning to washed sod for renovation and new construction? We asked three members of the Turfgrass Producers International (TPI), who offer

washed sod, for their opinions. Each comes from a different part of the country and has strong feelings about washed sod.

Time and money are major factors, but so are rootzone preparation and post-installation care, say the experts. The acceptance of washed sod is based on performance, which is based upon management, something not controlled by the sod grower. Not only does the customer need to be sold on the idea of paying up to 50 percent extra for washed sod, but he also needs to dedicate time and resources to properly care for it for up to two months following installation.

**Kingston Turf Farms** — Brian Bouchard, president of Kingston Turf Farms in Kingston, RI reports that demand for washed sod has diminished in New England.

"Golf courses in our region are buying less washed bentgrass lately," he says, "because they have the time to establish greens from seed, the money to build USGA greens, and are increasingly demanding about specific cultivars."

"When you plan to allow two years to build a course, and the golf course architect appreciates the value of seeded greens, and the superintendent is knowledgeable enough and has the time to successfully establish greens from seed, it makes sense," he noted. That's a lot of ifs, though.

Since the value of real estate in the region is relatively high, building golf courses has become a financially significant undertaking where cutting corners is unwise. Superintendents are better educated about cultivars and management.

Conversely, many of the courses in the region are older and USGA greens specs weren't used when they were built. Many superintendents are comfortable with soil greens and don't have as much experience with managing high-sand content greens.

"Part of the problem is many superintendents aren't taught about the option of washed or soilless sod," adds Bouchard. "With so much on the line, they naturally question factors they don't think they can control. Extra attention is needed after installing washed sod, but you can play on



it generally in two months. That's a lot less than a whole year with seed and you don't have the concern over soil incompatibility you would with sod grown on soil. It's mostly a matter of learning a few things."

Among them is the awareness that lateral stability is reduced. "When you wash the soil off the sod, you lose some of the side-to-side stability of the material," explains Bouchard.

"With unwashed sod, stability is pretty decent once the sod has rooted downward. Washed sod needs more time to reestablish lateral stability after rooting. Aerification, spiking and topdressing help, but the turf has to regrow lateral rhizomes and tillers before it's ready for play," he says.

Irrigation and fertility need to be watched more closely with washed sod, he says. Sand drains rapidly and does not hold onto nutrients. The percent of organic matter in USGA greensmix, usually selected peats, is very small. Bouchard has seen improvement in water and nutrient retention by adding a diatomaceous earth amendment (Axis).

Bouchard's interest in washed sod extends to inventing a device that removes soil without water. His brother, Darrell Bouchard at nearby Washington County Turf, has one of the few sod washers in the region and a number of sod growers use it.

"To wash sod you need the equipment, a lagoon to let the soil settle out of the wash water, and skilled labor," Brian remarks. "The washed sod is sopping wet when you ship it, even though it weighs less than half of normal sod. And, the washing unit is not portable."

He wanted to design a device that could be attached to or follow the sod harvester that used no water and left the soil on the field. It's a work in progress, but he has succeeded to a degree. While clay and silt are too stubborn for the vibrating piece of equipment to remove, it is effective with sand and loam.

Believe it or not, sod growers are laser leveling their fields and trucking in tons of coarse sand to grow turf that meets high-drainage requirements. The integrity of sand is poor, and Bouchard's vibrating soil cleaner fits the bill perfectly. "We can get the weight of the sod down to a third of normal," he

boasts. "That means we can put three times as much soilless sod on a single truck, enough to cover more than 30,000 sq. ft.!"

Plants hold their own moisture, Bouchard stresses. "It's not necessary to keep the washed sod soaking wet all the time. The process of washing is a delay between harvest and delivery. I'm trying to keep the time between harvesting and installation to an absolute minimum."

Kingston grows Kentucky bluegrasses and a number of creeping bentgrasses, that they also offer in soilless versions. Bouchard is most concerned about inadequate preparation for sodding. "We can communicate management tips for after installation rather easily, but it is very awkward when we deliver to a site that is obviously poorly prepared. Experience has shown us that failure is most often the result of poor preparation or follow-up care."

**West Coast Turf** — Jeff Cole has been marketing sod to western golf courses for more than 20 years and for West Coast Turf since its inception. Active in both golf and sports turf specialties, Cole is a skilled listener who advises owners John and Joe Foster in providing the broadest range of services to their customers.

"Our washed sod business is experiencing a resurgence," reveals Cole. "There were some rough

spots at first, but washed sod has a track record now to show it works well when a developer has to meet a timetable that doesn't allow for seeding. Architects realize it's the next best thing to seeding and the best solution when there isn't time to seed. There is a better overall understanding of greensmixes and turfgrasses and how they provide the best conditions under today's fast greens and heavy play."

"Once you spend the money to build a USGA green, you don't want to blow it by taking shortcuts with the turf." Cole credits better educated superintendents for the increased acceptance of washed sod.

"Washed sod is a tight mat of roots that

*"There is a better overall understanding of greensmixes and turfgrasses and how they provide the best conditions under today's fast greens and heavy play."*  
— Jeff Cole

needs to be opened up to establish percolation through the rootzone," says Cole. "The sod needs to be kept moist, so you irrigate frequently. But, you don't want it to act like a sponge sitting on top of an impervious surface.

He continues: "Some superintendents spike the day after installation and start light topdressing with sand. We recommend, as soon as roots have had a chance to

peg the sod down, that the sod be core cultivated and topdressed. This should be done more than once to restore firmness to the sod and to promote proper drainage."

The sod will have enough stored carbohydrates from fertilization by the grower to stay vigorous for a month or longer. To make sure nutrition is adequate after the first few weeks, superintendents can

have tissue samples tested. Due to the poor nutrient holding capacity of sand (that's why a small amount of peat is included in greensmixes) deficiencies can be corrected with light foliar feeding or fertigation.

Washed sod has advantages besides eliminating soil incompatibility, says Cole. "It is an important tool that allows West Coast to ship sod long distances or out of the country. It also lets the company meet an order from two or more farms without having to worry about soil problems.

"We have five farms spread out across California, Nevada and Arizona," he points out. "That can help us match soils for local projects in high growth areas. But washing the sod eliminates the concern over incompatibility."

Cole says once sod is washed, it weighs half of conventional sod. "That makes long distance shipping practical. You need to know what inspections are required and how to work with trucking companies and

airlines. We have flown sprigs to Asia and trucked sod to Mexico."

**Tifton Turf Farms** — Tifton Turf Farms in Tifton, GA is located just miles from the Georgia Coastal Experiment Station where advanced greens quality bermudagrasses were developed by Dr. Glenn Burton. Tifeagle, the latest in the "Tif" series, is a prime mover for washed sod at the 1,300 acre farm, explains President Michael Spinks.

"Our market is primarily golf with some retail," says Spinks. "We have two washers so we can harvest and wash a full load [9,072 sq. ft.] in one morning. We have the trained personnel ready to operate the washing machinery on staff. Washing sod is different from washing sprigs, it takes more expertise."

"We provide washing basically at cost as a service to our customers," he continues. "Washed sod is a limited market but our customers know we can provide this service quickly and in large volume. Architects look to us when they run into a time problem because they know we can meet their needs. That's what sod production is all about."

But Spinks admits, washed sod sales depend on the economy and golf course construction. "We are always looking for new uses and new places for our sod. Purity continues to be an issue with hybrid bermudagrasses, and our customers know we tow the line because we are so close to the Experiment Station. We price our products competitively. Customers should always remember that low price can hurt you when quality is critical, and that is definitely the case with washed sod for USGA greens. There are no short cuts or bargains. You have to do it right the first time."

*"Washed sod is a limited market, but our customers know we can provide this service quickly and in large volume. Architects look to us when they run into a time problem, because they know we can meet their needs."*

— Michael Spinks



# Insect Specimens

## Collection and Preparation

By Harry Niemczyk, Ph.D., OARDC, Ohio State University

**T**he key to effective control of any pest or disease is proper identification. When identification is needed, sample specimens can be sent to the Cooperative Extension entomologist at a Land Grant University, or other professional entomologists with knowledge of turf insects.

Except for moths and butterflies, the following is suggested when submitting immature and adult stages of insects to an entomologist for identification.

1. Collect 5 to 10 live specimens.
2. Immediately after collection, boil a small quantity of water (a cup of water in a microwave oven is satisfactory) and drop in the specimens after the water reaches the boiling temperature. Wait 30 seconds and pour off the water.
3. Drop the "blanched" specimens into a leak-proof vial of 60 to 80 percent ethyl alcohol. Vodka or denatured alcohol used as shellac thinner are sources of ethyl alcohol. **DO NOT USE ISOPROPYL (rubbing) ALCOHOL.**
4. Record the date, city, state and habitat location (e.g., leaves, thatch, soil, etc.) where the specimens were collected and tape on the outside of the vial and/or written **IN LEAD PENCIL** in a small piece of paper and place inside the vial. (Ballpoint pen ink will dissolve in the alcohol.)
5. Include a note with your name, address and phone number, plus any additional information that might be helpful to the specialist.
6. Ship the vial in a crush-proof container. Moths such as cutworms or sod webworms and butterflies must be sent **DRY** and require special provisions to prevent destruction in shipping. Directions for such shipments should be obtained from the person or agency to whom the specimens are to be sent.

### Developing a Collection

When correctly identified, insect specimens can be assembled into a useful collection for future reference and training. If properly preserved and sealed, the specimens in a collection last indefinitely.

**Killing and Preservation.** The larvae of insects are soft-bodied and require special preparation before long-term preservation. Two methods may be used.

1. Live larvae are killed in a solution of one part 95 percent ethyl alcohol (shellac thinner) and one part xylene. Both ingredients are available from scientific supply companies. After 24 hours, transfer the specimens to a glass screw-top vial containing 75 percent ethyl alcohol.
2. OR, live larvae are dropped into boiling water for 30-60 seconds. The specimens are then transferred to a glass screw-top vial containing 75 percent ethyl alcohol for permanent preservation. Replace the alcohol with clean 75 percent ethyl alcohol within 7 to 10 days. Living adult beetles such as Japanese beetle, billbugs, masked chafers, etc., may be killed by direct emersion into 75 percent ethyl alcohol for at least 24 hours and transferred to clean 75 percent ethyl alcohol. Both larvae and adults of one species can be stored in one vial. Caps for the screw-top vials used for permanent storage should have poly-seal inserts to prevent evaporation of the alcohol.

Self-adhesive labels bearing the common name of the insect should be placed on the outside of each vial. Be careful. Any label placed inside the vial must be printed using permanent, water-proof black India ink. Other inks will dissolve in the alcohol.

**Display.** Vials with specimens can be displayed in many ways. A wood 2" x 4" with evenly spaced holes of the same diameter as the vials works well.

# 1999 Article Index

**Annual Bluegrass Weevil:** A Metropolitan Nightmare by Patricia Vittum, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, May, pg. 1.

**Bentgrass Green Performance:** Initial Investigations of Mowing Height and Rolling by D.M. Kopec, J. Long, D. Kerr and J.J. Gilbert of the University of Arizona, College of Agriculture, Tucson, Jan., pg. 9.

**Black Turfgrass Ataenius:** Pest of Increasing Importance in Highly Managed Turf by Nikki Rothwell, University of Massachusetts, July pg. 1.

**The Impact of Climate on Turfgrass Pest Activity** by Chris Sann, Pest Forecasting Group, Oct. pg. 8.

**Composts to Improve Turfgrass Performance** by Peter Landschoot, Pennsylvania State University, Apr. pg. 12.

**Smooth Crabgrass Emergence Prediction Using Degree Days** by Michael Fidenza, AgrEvo, Wilmington, DE, Apr. pg. 1.

**Food Quality Protection Act and Its Impact on Turfgrass Mgmt.** by R.L. Brandenburg, North Carolina State University, July, pg. 9.

**Golf Green Construction: A Review of the UC Method** by M. Ali Harivandi, University of California Cooperative Extension, San Francisco, July pg. 14.

**Gray Leaf Spot: An Emerging Disease of Perennial Ryegrass** by Paul Vincelli, Department of Plant Pathology, University of Kentucky, June, pg. 1.

**Green Kyllinga: Sedge Weed of Turf and Ornamentals** by Cudney, Elmore, Shaw and Wilen, University of California, June pg. 14.

**How Turfgrasses Grow** by Richard J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island, May pg. 7.

**Scarab Grubs: Sampling and Identification** by Jennifer Grant, Cornell University, Sept. pg. 1.

**Humic Substances and Their Potential for Improving Turfgrass Growth** by Richard Cooper, Department of Crop Science, North Carolina State University, June pg. 9.

**Humic Substances and Their Influence on**

**Creeping Bentgrass Growth and Stress Tolerance** by Chunhua Liu of Clemson University, Aug. pg. 6.

**Iron Usage by Turfgrasses** by Richards J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island, Feb. pg. 1.

**Documenting Irrigation Systems Accurately With Global Positioning** by Cory Metlar, S.V. Moffett Co. West Henrietta, NY, Nov. pg. 11.

**Not All Microbes Are Created Equal** by David Drahos, Sybron Biochemical Division, Nov. pg. 4.

**Turfgrass Pests Remain a Constant Challenge** by R.L. Brandenburg, North Carolina State University, Sept. pg. 8.

**Plant-Soil Organism Symbiosis: The Importance of Mycorrhiza** by Nicolas Malajczuk, Norma Jones and Constance Neele, The World Bank, Dec. pg. 1.

**Speeding Transition of Overseeded Perennial Ryegrass** by Coleman Ward and Jeffrey Higgins of Auburn University, May pg. 14.

**Imported Pest Defoliates Redgum Eucalyptus in West** by Rosser Garrison, Los Angeles County Commissioner's Office, Nov. pg. 11.

**Soil Amendments Reduce Nitrate Leaching** by Cale Bigelow, D. Keith Cassel and Daniel Bowman, North Carolina State University, Sept. pg. 11.

**Soil Inclusions' Impact on Soil Physical Properties and Athletic Field Quality** by Andrews McNitt and Peter Landschoot, Pennsylvania State University, Feb. pg. 12.

**Taking Soil Samples.** Dec. pg. 14.

**Summer Decline: Can Cool-Season Turfgrasses Take the Heat?** by Richard J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island, Oct. pg. 1.

**Suppression of Bermudagrass In Perennial Ryegrass Turf Using Selective Herbicides** by D.M. Kopec and J.J. Gilbert of the University of Arizona, College of Agriculture, Tucson, Jan., pg. 1.

**Transition Enhancement Using Post-Emergence Herbicides** by D.M. Kopec and J.J. Gilbert, University of Arizona, Aug. pg. 13.



**In Praise of Turf: Lawn Maintenance From an Eastern Homeowner's Perspective** by Richard J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island. Dec. pg. 10.

**Turfgrass Selection: Comparing Three Turfgrasses for Minimum Irrigation Requirements, Drought Resistance and Long-Term Performance** by Y.L. Qian of the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Colorado State University, Fort Collins and M.C. Engelke of Texas A&M University Research and Extension Center in Dallas. Jan., pg. 4.

**Water: How Turfgrasses Obtain and Use Moisture** by Richard J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island. Aug. pg. 1.

**Non-Potable Water: Conversion of Golf Courses and Parks to Alternate Water Sources** by Donna Pacetti, Denver Water. Sept. pg. 12.

**Weeds: Shedding New Light on an Old Foe** by Karl Danneberger, Department of Horticulture and Crop Science, Ohio State University. Nov. pg. 1.

**Winter Injury: Understanding the Effects and Research Efforts** by Frank S. Rossi, Cornell University. March, pg. 1.

**Winter Spring Nutrient Use** by Cool- and Warm-Season Turf by Richard J. Hull of the Plant Sciences Department at the University of Rhode Island. March pg. 11.

**Zoysiagrass in Shade: Influence of Trinexapac-ethyl** by Y.L. Qian of the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Colorado State University, Fort Collins and M.C. Engelke of Texas A&M University Research and Extension Center in Dallas. Jan., pg. 12.

## In Future Issues

- A Coursewide Approach to Poa Annua Control
- Fertigation
- Drainage System Troubleshooting
- The Image of Golf Courses as Wildlife Habitat

# TURFGRASS TRENDS

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Business: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

City: \_\_\_\_\_

State: \_\_\_\_\_

Zip: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: (     ) \_\_\_\_\_

TURFGRASS TRENDS • 131 West First Street • Duluth, MN 55802-2065

1/00

## ORDER

- YES, Send the **TURFGRASS TRENDS** subscription that I have marked.

(12 issues per year)

- ☐ **6 months @ \$96.00**  
☐ **1 year @ \$180.00**  
☐ **1 year overseas @ \$210**

- ☐ **Payment Enclosed**  
☐ **Please Bill Me**

- For faster service please call:  
1-888-527-7008 or  
FAX your completed form to:  
1-218-723-9417 or 9437

## TURFGRASS TRENDS

TurfGrass Trends is published monthly. ISSN 1076-7207.

Subscription rates: One year, \$180 (US); \$210 (all other countries.)

Copyright © 1999 by Advanstar Communications, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use, or the internal or personal use of specific clients, is granted by Advanstar Communications Inc. for libraries and other users registered with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Dr., Danvers, MA 01923. phone: 978-750-8400 fax 978-750-4470; call for copying beyond that permitted by Sections 107 or 108 of the U.S. Copyright Law. For those not registered with the CCC, send permission request in writing to Permissions Dept. Advanstar Communications Inc. 7500 Old Oak Blvd., Cleveland, OH 44130-3369 or fax (440) 891-2740.



**ADVANSTAR**  
COMMUNICATIONS

Postmaster: Send address changes to TurfGrass Trends, 131 West First St., Duluth, MN 55802-2065.

### FIELD ADVISORS

**Rob Anthony**, Green Bay Packers

**J. Douglas Barberry**, Turf Producers International

**Richard Bator**, Atlantic City Country Club

**F. Dan Dinelli**, North Shore Country Club

**Merrill J. Frank**, Columbia Country Club

**Michael Heacock**, American Golf Corp.

**Vince Hendersen**, River's Bend Country Club

**Paul Latshaw**, Merion Golf Club

**Kevin Morris**, National Turfgrass Evaluation Program

**Sean Remington**, Chery Chase Club

**Tom Schlick**, Marriott Golf

**Ken Schwark**, Roddy Ranch Golf Course

**Paul Zwaska**, Baltimore Orioles

### EDITORIAL REVIEW BOARD

**Dr. A.J. Powell**, University of Kentucky

**Dr. Elliot C. Roberts**, Rosehall Associates

**Dr. Gerald Horst**, University of Nebraska

**Dr. Doug Brede**, Jacklin Seed Company

**Dr. Eric Nelson**, Cornell University

**Dr. Keith Karnok**, University of Georgia

**Dr. Michael Villani**, Cornell University

**Dr. Richard Hull**, University of Rhode Island

**Dr. Vic Gibeault**, University of California

**Dr. Pat Vittum**, University of Massachusetts

**Dr. Rick Brandenburg**, NC State University

### QUICK REFERENCE NUMBERS

**Editorial:** 440/891-2729

**Subscription:** 888/527-7008

**Permissions:** 440/891-2740

**Reprints:** 440/891-2744

**Single copy or back issues:** 218/723-9477

**Website:** [www.landscapergroup.com](http://www.landscapergroup.com)

### USE OF TGT ARTICLES

PERMISSION MAY BE GRANTED ON REQUEST FOR TGT ARTICLES AS COURSE MATERIAL AND FOR REPRINTS IN PUBLICATIONS.

For course material: We can group articles by subject for you.

Please send request to:

*TurfGrass Trends*  
Advanstar, Attn: Permissions  
7500 Old Oak Blvd.  
Cleveland, OH 44130  
800/225-4569, ext. 742

Index and abstracts are available electronically through: [www.landscapergroup.com](http://www.landscapergroup.com) and Michigan State University, TGIF 800-446-8443, <http://www.lib.msu.edu/tgif>

PSRST STD  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
DULUTH, MN  
PERMIT NO. 1900

# TURFGRASS TRENDS

131 West First Street  
Duluth, MN 55802-2065

