

THE EFFECT OF GROWING DEGREE DAY SCHEDULED TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL
APPLICATIONS ON THE GROWTH RATE AND FERTILITY REQUIREMENTS OF
CREEPING BENTGRASS GOLF PUTTING GREENS

by

William C. Kreuser

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of

The requirements for the degree of

Master of Science

(Soil Science)

At the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2010

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a master's thesis by

William C. Kreuser

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,

and that any and all revisions required by the final

examining committee have been made.

Dr. Douglas J. Soldat

Name of Faculty Advisor

Signature of Faculty Advisor

Date

GRADUATE SCHOOL

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like thank everyone that has helped me complete this master's degree. My interest in science was cultivated by many very dedicated and enthusiastic science teachers during elementary, middle, and high school. I would like to specifically thank Mr. Mike McGinnis and Mrs. Susan Getzel as they provided support and motivation to become a better scientist and embrace a life in the sciences. I would also like to thank Jerry Kershasky at Westmoor Country Club. Jerry always made time to help advance my career in the turfgrass industry as well as pushed me to be a detail oriented, reliable, and hard working person. During my time at the University of Wisconsin-Madison several professors contributed to my growth as a person and scientist. Drs. Birl Lowery and Phillip Barak were always willing to offer advice and support and for that I'm extremely grateful.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Wayne Kussow and Dr. Doug Soldat as my advisors as an undergraduate and graduate student. Dr. Kussow provided me the opportunity to conduct research during my first month at UW-Madison, introducing me to laboratory and field techniques. He also introduced me to statistical analysis and extension writing, in addition to the library of books in his office. My work with Dr. Kussow sophomore year provided the seed that grew into this thesis.

Dr. Soldat proved to be the perfect advisor for me. He gave me freedom, funding, and support to research topics for which I was passionate. It must have taken a great deal of faith for Dr. Soldat to give an undergrad at the time such freedom and that turned out to be such a benefit to my development. The most important skill I gained while working with Dr. Soldat is not to accept what we think we know and to always question the convention.

I would especially like to thank my family. My mom and dad (Kathy and Bill) and my sister and brother (Erin and John) have always supported me and demanded I be the best that I can be and to not get too far ahead of myself. It took a lot of faith to let their 15 year old son dig up the back yard to install a putting green which started me on my path in turfgrass science. I would also like to thank my grandparents for their love and support. I really credit my grandpa Floyd Andrich helping to develop my always ask why attitude at a very young age. I would like to dedicate this thesis to him.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

AKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	x
ABSTRACT.....	xii

CHAPTER ONE: TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL LITERATURE REVIEW.....	1
ABSTRACT.....	1
LITERATURE REVIEW.....	2
Clipping Yield.....	3
Turfgrass Carbohydrates.....	6
Color, Visual Quality, and Density.....	7
Root Architecture and Nutrient Uptake.....	8
Trinexapac-ethyl Absorption, Translocation, and Metabolism.....	8
REFERENCES.....	12

CHAPTER TWO: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A GROWING DEGREE DAY MODEL FOR TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL APPLICATIONS TO CREEPING BENTGRASS GOLF COURSE PUTTING GREENS.....	17
ABSTRACT.....	17
INTRODUCTION.....	19
METHODS.....	23

Experiment 1: Model Development.....	23
Site Description.....	23
Experimental Design.....	23
Data Collection.....	25
Statistical Analysis.....	25
Experiment 2: Model Validation.....	26
Site Description.....	26
Experimental Design.....	27
Data Collection.....	27
Statistical Analysis.....	27
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	30
Weather Data.....	30
Experiment 1: Model Development	32
Clipping Yield.....	32
Color and Quality.....	38
Experiment 2: Model Validation.....	43
Clipping Yield.....	43
Color and Quality.....	48
CONCLUSIONS.....	54
REFERENCES.....	55
 CHAPTER THREE: THE INFLUENCE OF TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL ON CREEPING BENTGRASS GOLF PUTTING GREEN NITROGEN REQUIREMENTS.....	 58
ABSTRACT.....	58

INTRODUCTION	60
METHODS	62
Site Description and Experimental Design.....	62
Data Collection.....	65
Statistical Analysis.....	66
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	67
Clipping Yield.....	67
Clipping Nitrogen Content and Nitrogen Removal.....	68
Color and Visual Quality.....	73
CONCLUSIONS	76
REFERENCES	77

CHAPTER FOUR: THE INFLUENCE OF TRINEXAPAC-ETHYL ON CREEPING BENTGRASS GOLF PUTTING GREEN CRITICAL SOIL TEST PHOSPHORUS LEVEL	79
ABSTRACT	79
INTRODUCTION	80
METHODS	82
Green Construction and Experimental Design.....	82
2009-2010 Experimental Protocol.....	83
Data Collection.....	84
Statistical Analysis.....	85
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	86
Soil Test Values.....	86
Visual Quality and Color Index.....	89

Clipping Yield.....	93
Clipping Tissue Phosphorus Content.....	98
Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Prominence.....	98
CONCLUSIONS	100
REFERENCES	101

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER TWO:

- Figure 2.1. Mean daily air temperature in Madison, WI during the 2008 (A), 2009 (B), and 2010 (C) with respect to 30 year average temperature ($^{\circ}\text{C}$). 2008 was close to the daily average air temperature while 2009 and 2010 were below and above average, respectively..... 31
- Figure 2.2. The relative clipping yields of the 400 GDD, 800 GDD, and four week trinexapac-ethyl (TE) re-application intervals were pooled together and plotted versus cumulative GDD after previous TE application. Fourth order sine regression analysis was highly significant and was used to develop a TE relative yield response model. Values less than one signifies yield suppression while values greater than one signifies yield enhancement in comparison to the control. Cumulative GDD was calculated as the summation of the mean daily air temperature base 0°C . The GDD was reset to zero following TE application.....33
- Figure 2.3. The selection of the most appropriate GDD model base temperature was determined by recalculating cumulative GDD in figure 2.1 from 0 to 12°C . The R^2 values for each base temperature were determined following fourth order sine regression. The 0°C had the highest R^2 value and was used as the base temperature..... 34
- Figure 2.4. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl re-application interval on relative color index in 2008. The dashed line represents the color index non-treated control. GDD is the summation of daily average air temperature in degrees Celsius. TE is re-applied one each GDD threshold is surpassed. GDD is reset to zero after TE is re-applied.....41
- Figure 2.5. The effect of trinexapac re-application interval on relative visual quality in 2008. The dashed line represents the visual quality of non-treated control. GDD is the summation of daily average air temperature in degrees Celsius. TE is re-applied one each GDD threshold is surpassed. GDD is reset to zero after TE is re-applied.....42
- Figure 2.6. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate on relative clipping yield when TE is re-applied every four weeks in 2009 (A) and 2010 (B).....44

- Figure 2.7. The effect of four week trinexapac-ethyl (TE) re-applications at different rates on relative clipping yield from Experiment #2. The predicted relative clipping yield from Experiment #1 is indicated by the solid line. The dashed line represents the relative clipping yield of the control. Data from 2009 and 2010 were pooled together at each application rate for greater model resolution.....45
- Figure 2.8. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate on relative clipping yield when TE is re-applied every 200 GDD in 2009 (C) and 2010 (D). TE is re-applied one each GDD threshold is surpassed. GDD is reset to zero after TE is re-applied.....46
- Figure 2.9. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate on turfgrass visual quality during 2009 (A) and 2010 (B).....52
- Figure 2.10. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate on turfgrass color index during 2009 (A) and 2010 (B).....53

CHAPTER THREE:

- Figure 3.1. The effect of biweekly nitrogen rate (5, 10, 20 kg N ha⁻¹) and trinexapac-ethyl (TE) on clipping yield during 2008 (A and D), 2009 (B and E), and 2010 (C and F). TE was applied every three weeks at 0.05 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ in 2008. During 2009 and 2010, TE was applied every 200 GDD at the rate of 0.10 kg a.i. ha⁻¹. GDD was the summation of mean daily air temperature, base 0°C, after TE application. After 200 GDD, TE was re-applied and the model was reset to zero.....72
- Figure 3.2. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) on color index and visual quality during 2008 (A and D), 2009 (B and E), and 2010 (C and F). TE was applied every three weeks at 0.05 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ in 2008. During 2009 and 2010, TE was applied every 200 GDD at the rate of 0.10 kg a.i. ha⁻¹. GDD was the summation of mean daily air temperature, base 0°C, after TE application. After 200 GDD, TE was re-applied and the model was reset to zero.....75

CHAPTER FOUR:

- Figure 4.1. The change in plot soil test P level from the beginning of this study on 22 May 2009 to the end on 1 July 2009. The alkaline soil pH after construction and sand calcareous parent material likely caused increased P immobilization...87
- Figure 4.2. The effect of soil test P (STP) level on turfgrass visual quality (A), color index (B), clipping yield (C), and clipping tissue P level (D) on 1 July 2010. These figures are representative of all sampling dates described in this chapter....90
- Figure 4.3. Visual quality soil test P (STP) critical value as a function of date and trinexapac-ethyl (TE). Rating days where TE significantly affected STP critical value are denoted with an asterisk. Error bars represent standard error of the mean with 16 degrees of freedom.....91
- Figure 4.4. Color index soil test P (STP) critical value as a function of date and trinexapac-ethyl (TE). Rating days where TE significantly affected STP critical value are denoted with an asterisk. Error bars represent standard error of the mean with 16 degrees of freedom.....92
- Figure 4.5. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) and date on visual quality plateau. Asterisks signify dates were TE significantly enhanced turfgrass visual quality. Application of TE into late fall 2009 enhanced early spring visual quality ratings on 1 April 2010. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate with 16 degrees of freedom.....94
- Figure 4.6. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) and date on color index plateau. Asterisks signify dates were TE significantly enhanced turfgrass color index. Application of TE into late fall 2009 enhanced early spring color index on 1 April 2010. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate with 16 degrees of freedom.....95
- Figure 4.7. Clipping yield soil test P (STP) critical value as a function of date and trinexapac-ethyl (TE). Rating days where TE significantly affected STP critical value are denoted with an asterisk. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate with 16 degrees of freedom.....96
- Figure 4.8. The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) and date on clipping yield plateau. Asterisks signify dates were TE significantly suppressed turfgrass clipping yield. Error bars represent standard error of the estimate with 16 degrees of freedom.....97

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE:

Table 1.1.	The influence of TE application rate and re-application frequency on magnitude and duration of growth suppression in various turfgrass species.....	5
------------	---	---

CHAPTER TWO:

Table 2.1.	The influence of TE application rate and re-application frequency on magnitude and duration of growth suppression in various turfgrass species.....	20
Table 2.2.	Trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application dates in 2008 for all treatments in Experiment #1. Application rate was 0.05 kg a.i. ha ⁻¹ for all treatments.....	24
Table 2.3.	Trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application dates in 2009-2010 for all treatments in Experiment #2. Application rates were 0.00, 0.05, and 0.10 kg a.i. ha ⁻¹ for each re-application interval.....	29
Table 2.4.	The ANOVA table for the relative clipping yield of the 100 GDD, 200 GDD, and non-treated control treatments. Slope (GDD) was not significant for both the 100 GDD and 200 GDD treatments. However the intercept (re-application interval) was highly significant and resulted in maintained relative yield suppression regardless of GDD.....	36
Table 2.5.	The area under the growth curve calculation of net annual clipping yield across all trinexapac-ethyl re-application treatments at the 0.05 kg a.i. ha ⁻¹ application rate. The 100 GDD and 200 GDD were the only treatments that had reduced net yield compared to the non-treated control.....	37
Table 2.6.	The ANOVA table for the effect of trinexapac-ethyl re-application interval, date, block, and re-application interval by date interaction on turfgrass visual quality and color.....	39
Table 2.7.	The effect of trinexapac-ethyl re-application interval on both actual and relative visual quality and color.....	40

Table 2.8.	The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate and re-application interval on relative clipping yield from treatments in Experiment #1 and #2 where season-long clipping suppression was maintained. Data from 2009 and 2010 were pooled together at for each respective application rate. Application rate did not affect the magnitude of clipping suppression in Experiment #2. Both application rates re-applied every 200 GDD in Experiment #2 had similar relative yield suppression as the 100 GDD re-application interval in Experiment #1.....	47
Table 2.9.	The ANOVA table for the effects of trinexapac-ethyl application rate, re-application interval, date, and interactions on visual quality and color index.....	50
Table 2.10.	The effect of trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application rate on turfgrass visual quality and color index during Experiment #2.....	51

CHAPTER THREE:

Table 3.1.	The fertility record for all three nitrogen treatments during years one, two, and three.....	63
Table 3.2.	Trinexapac-ethyl application dates and rates to appropriate treatments.....	64
Table 3.3.	F ratios and <i>p</i> -values from ANOVA for treatment, year, and date effects on turfgrass attributes during year one (2008) of this study.....	69
Table 3.4.	F ratios and <i>p</i> -values from ANOVA for treatment, year, and date effects on turfgrass attributes during years two and three (2009-2010) of this study...	70
Table 3.5.	The effect of N rate and trinexapac-ethyl (TE) application on turfgrass clipping yield, visual quality (1-9 scale; 1 is dead, 6 minimally acceptable, and 9 perfect turfgrass quality), color index, clipping tissue N content, and N removal. There was a significant TE x N interaction for clipping yield.....	71

CHAPTER FOUR:

Table 4.1.	The change in STP level of the soil standard during monthly sampling.....	88
Table 4.2.	The effect of soil test P (STP) and trinexapac-ethyl (TE) on arbuscular mycorrhizal fungal associations. Application of TE sustained AMF associations regardless of STP level. Arbuscule counts back-transformed from a logarithmic transformation.....	99

THESIS ABSTRACT

The plant growth regulator trinexapac-ethyl (TE) is widely used on golf course putting greens across the US. Numerous researchers have shown TE applications reduce clipping yield and increase turfgrass color, quality, and tiller density on a variety of cool- and warm-season turfgrass species. However, there has been limited research on the duration and magnitude of growth suppression on creeping bentgrass (*Agrostis stolonifera* Hud.) golf putting greens. Duration of TE-induced growth suppression is affected by plant metabolism which is strongly related to air temperature. The objectives of this thesis were to 1) investigate the effect of TE on yield of creeping bentgrass golf putting greens, 2) develop a growing degree day (GDD) model to predict duration of TE efficacy, and 3) investigate the effect of season long growth inhibition on creeping bentgrass nitrogen and phosphorus requirements. A GDD model was calibrated by measuring daily clipping yield following multiple TE applications. Re-application intervals varied and were based on several different GDD thresholds, base 0°C. Re-application of TE every 200 GDD resulted in season-long clipping yield suppression and was in contrast to the label directions (four week re-application interval) which did not result in clipping yield reductions over the course of the season. Application rate had little effect on the duration of clipping suppression and suggests that 200 GDD interval is adequate for all practical TE application rates on golf putting greens. The 200 GDD re-application interval sustained color and quality enhancements. Repeated TE applications every 200 GDD reduced nitrogen fertility requirements by 30-50% compared non-treated creeping bentgrass based on color and quality measurements. Trinexapac-ethyl also reduced Mehlich-3 soil test phosphorus critical values on several rating days however, the average reduction was less than variation that occurs between sampling

days and therefore practically inconsequential. In conclusion, this research has thoroughly investigated the effect of various TE application rate and re-application frequencies on creeping bentgrass putting greens. Re-applying TE every 200 GDD provided season-long yield suppression and resulted in increased color and quality allowing for substantially decreased nitrogen fertilization.

Chapter One: Trinexapac-ethyl Literature Review

ABSTRACT

The plant growth regulator trinexapac-ethyl (TE) was originally developed to reduce turfgrass mowing requirements. Additionally, TE has been reported to increase turfgrass color, density, and visual quality. Trinexapac-ethyl influences these turfgrass attributes by inhibiting synthesis of the plant hormone gibberellic acid; which initiates cell elongation. Numerous research articles have demonstrated TE suppresses clipping yield of many turfgrass species by 50% for four weeks. A notable exception is the creeping bentgrass (*Agrostis stolonifera* Hud.) golf putting greens which are substantially less affected by TE.

Trinexapac-ethyl affects clipping yield in two phases, relative yield suppression followed by yield enhancement. Enhancement of color and visual quality occur during the suppression phase and dissipate during the yield enhancement phase. Therefore maintaining relative yield suppression is desirable. Metabolism of TE is directly related to air temperature. The half life of TE in creeping bentgrass was found to be 5.3 days in a growth chamber with air temperature at 18°C and 3.4 days at 30°C. Calendar-based TE application intervals are therefore inefficient because they do not reflect air temperature and plant metabolism. Development of a TE metabolism model, based on air temperature, would indicate when TE re-applications are necessary to maintain yield suppression and sustain color and quality enhancement.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Mowing is the most labor and fuel intensive practice associated with turfgrass management. It has been estimated that 70 to 80% of budget of a low budget golf course is spent on mowing. Therefore, growth reducing chemicals have the potential to significantly reduce mowing costs. Research with various compounds to reduce turfgrass growth rate have been sought since the 1940s (Watschke and DiPaola, 1995). The first compounds, called plant growth regulators (PGR), caused growth inhibition by slowing plant cell division. However applications of these PGRs caused turfgrass phytotoxicity which limited their use to low maintenance turf like roadsides and other hard to mow areas (Murphy et al., 2005). Eventually, PGRs with lower phytotoxicity were developed. These products inhibit gibberellic acid (GA) production and can safely be applied to turfgrass of any maintenance standard with little detrimental effect on turfgrass color or quality (Watschke and DiPaola, 1995). Trinexapac-ethyl is a GA-inhibiting PGR that became commercially available in the US during the early 1990s. This product quickly became used widely on golf course putting greens, tee, fairways, and athletic fields. In addition to growth suppression, TE has been shown to enhance turfgrass color, tiller density, and quality, and alter root architecture, carbohydrate concentrations, and nutrient allocation (Ervin and Zhang, 2008).

The rate of plant cell expansion is typically controlled by the plant hormones called gibberellins or gibberellic acids (Taiz and Zeiger, 2006). There are many structural forms of compounds classified as gibberellins; however, only gibberellins with particular chemical structures increase cell expansion (Taiz and Zeiger, 2006). In cool season turfgrasses, GA₁ increases cell expansion and growth rate (Reid and Ross, 1991). GA₂₀ is the inactive precursor of GA that undergoes dehydroxylation to form GA₁ via 3 β -hydroxylase. This process is regulated by 2-oxoglutaric acid inhibition of 3 β -hydroxylase (Rademacher, 2000). Trinexapac-

ethyl (4-[cyclopropyl- α -hydroxy-methylene]-3,5-dioxo-cyclohexane-carboxylic acid ethyl ester) is a foliarly absorbed compound that is converted by the plant to trinexapac acid, a structural mimic of 2-oxoglutaric acid (Beasley and Branham, 2005). After conversion, trinexapac acid acts in conjunction with 2-oxoglutaric acid to inhibit 3 β -hydroxylase conversion of the inactive GA₂₀ to the active GA₁ form (Rademacher, 2000). Tan and Qian (2003) showed that TE applied at 0.1 kg ha⁻¹ reduced GA₁ leaf concentrations by 46% while GA₂₀ concentrations increased by 146% compared to the non-treated Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*). The reduction in GA₁ corresponded to a 50% reduction in mean weekly clipping yield, providing solid evidence that TE inhibits growth rate by reducing GA₁ concentration.

Clipping Yield

Trinexapac-ethyl is currently labeled in the US for use on all commonly grown cool- and warm-season turfgrasses. The Primo Maxx label (Syngenta Co., Greensboro, NC) lists numerous application rates dependent upon turfgrass species and maintenance standards (i.e. golf course putting greens and fairways). These application rates are stated to suppress clipping yield by 50% for four weeks. However, the label also states that application rate and frequency may need adjusting depending on management practices and environmental conditions. Such adjustment of TE application rate is difficult because confirmation of actual yield reductions in the field is not easily accomplished. Instead, turfgrass managers rely on researchers across the country to investigate the magnitude and duration of growth suppression caused by TE on various grasses (Table 1.1). Johnson (1994) first demonstrated TE induced growth suppression on hybrid and common bermudagrass. He demonstrated that monthly TE applications reduced the number of mowing applications required during a growing season by 30%. For a majority of turfgrass species the labeled application rate suppresses yield by 50% for four weeks (Table 1.1).

The notable exception is creeping bentgrass maintained at putting green mowing height. Interestingly, golf course putting greens routinely receive multiple TE applications. McCullough et al. (2006b) showed that TE-treated creeping bentgrass grown in the south-eastern US experienced a 20% decrease in yield which lasted for two weeks at the labeled application rate. . In 2007, McCullough et al. reported the effects of TE application rate and re-application frequency on a creeping bentgrass putting green during spring in South Carolina. The TE treatments consisted of labeled rate ($0.05 \text{ kg a.i. ha}^{-1}$) applied every three weeks, 2/3 labeled rate applied biweekly, and 1/3 labeled rate applied weekly. Clipping yield reductions ranged from 0 to 40% during the experiment. Application rate did not affect the magnitude of growth suppression, but more frequent application intervals reduced daily clipping yield fluctuations compared to the control. This is in contrast to a 'Tifway' bermudagrass putting green that maintained 55% yield reduction for four weeks in that same study. It is unfortunate that this experiment was terminated prior to warmer summer months. To date, no one has measured the effect TE application rate and interval has on creeping bentgrass yield clipping yield during an entire growing season.

TE alters growth rate in two distinct phases. Fagerness and Yelverton (2000) described a period of enhanced clipping yield following growth suppression called 'post-inhibition growth enhancement' in comparison to non-treated bermudagrass. This growth response will be hereafter referred to as the rebound phase of growth regulation and has been observed with other turfgrass species including creeping bentgrass and Kentucky bluegrass (Beasley and Branham, 2005). Researchers have speculated that the rebound phase is caused by an accumulation of total non-structural carbohydrates during the suppression phase which enhances clipping yield during rebound (Ervin and Zhang, 2008). However, based on the findings of Tan and Qian (2003),

another reasonable hypothesis is that the rebound phase is a result of GA₂₀ accumulation during the suppression phases which is converted to GA₁ after TE has been metabolized.

Table 1.1. The influence of TE application rate and re-application frequency on magnitude and duration of growth suppression in various turfgrass species.

Turfgrass Species and Mowing Height	Application Rate	Re-application Frequency	Growth Suppression	Approximate Duration of Growth Suppression	Reference
Common name; mm	kg a.i. ha ⁻¹	Weeks	% of control	Weeks	
Creeping bentgrass; 3.2	0.05	4	20%	2	McCullough et al., 2006b
Creeping bentgrass; 3.2	0.02, 0.03, 0.05	1, 2, 3	20-40%	3	McCullough et al., 2007
Kentucky bluegrass; 30	0.05	4-6	20%	4-6	Stier and Rodgers, 2001
Kentucky bluegrass, 35	0.05	4	50%	4	Tan and Qian, 2003
Kentucky bluegrass; 32	0.14, 0.29, 0.58	none	44-73%	4-5†	Beasley and Branahm., 2007
Rough bluegrass; 80	0.29	6	55-80%	6	Gardner and Wherley, 2005
Sheep fescue; 80	0.29	6	35-50%	6	Gardner and Wherley, 2005
St. Augustinegrass; 75	0.14, 0.29	2, 4	50%	4	McCarty et al., 2004
Supina bluegrass; 30	0.05	4-6	60%	4-6	Stier and Rodgers, 2001
Tall fescue; 38	0.29	none	44-77%	4	Richie et al., 2001
Tall fescue; 80	0.29	6	58-76%	6	Gardner and Wherley, 2005
‘TifEagle’ Bermudagrass; 3.2	0.05	4	60%	3	McCullough et al., 2007
‘Tifway’ Bermudagrass; 16	0.07, 0.11	4	60%	4	Fagerness and Yelverton, 2000
‘Tifway’ Bermudagrass; 25	0.11	4	50%	4	Fagerness et al., 2004
Zoysiagrass; 12	0.05, 0.10, 0.19	4, 8, 12	25, 27, 0%	4-6	Qian and Engelke, 1999

† Duration dependent on summer or fall season

Turfgrass Carbohydrates

Han et al. (1998, 2004) that total nonstructural carbohydrate concentrations (TNC) increased in the verdure of creeping bentgrass two weeks after initial TE application. Elevated TNC levels then declined 4 to 16 weeks after TE application. A similar phenomenon occurred in hybrid bermudagrass after sequential TE applications (Waltz and Whitwell, 2005). Richie et al. (2001) stated in the title of their publication that there was no increase in TNC in tall fescue 6 -7 weeks after a single TE application; this result is not surprising based on the findings of Han et al. (1998, 2004). Temporal variability of TNC concentrations are likely result of the suppression and rebound growth phases. Increased TNC concentration in the plant two weeks after TE application coincides with yield suppression and is supported by Table 1.1. As turfgrass growth rate increases during the rebound phase, TNC concentrations diminish as a result of increased growth rate.

Trinexapac-ethyl does not alter photosynthetic production in both warm- and cool-season grasses (Qian et al., 1998; Steinke and Stier, 2003). Heckman et al. (2001) showed that TE may suppress mitochondrial respiration. Additionally, TE applications increased cell cytokinin content which is also known to suppress respiration (Ervin and Zhang, 2008; Mok and Mok, 1994). Decreased respiration rate following TE applications reduced the sod roll temperature because heat accumulation is directly attributed to plant respiration (Heckman et al., 2001). Suppression of respiration in conjunction with maintained photosynthetic rate would cause increased net photosynthesis (Ervin and Zhang, 2008). Therefore, sustaining yield suppression with more frequent TE applications may sustain increased net photosynthesis and result in higher TNC concentration.

Turfgrass Color, Quality, and Density

In addition to decreased clipping yield, TE applications have been shown to increase turfgrass visual quality, color, and shoot density (Ervin and Zhang, 2008). Decreased GA₁ concentration causes reduced leaf cell length, increased mesophyll cell density, and increased chlorophyll concentration which causes increased turfgrass color (Ervin and Koski, 2001b; Stier and Rodgers, 2001; Bunnell et al., 2005) . Multiple TE applications have also increased turfgrass tiller density and leaf area (Ervin and Koski, 1998; Beasley and Branham, 2007). Turfgrass quality enhancements have been positively correlated with TE applications on many grass species (Ervin and Koski, 2001b; Goss et al., 2002; Steinke and Stier, 2003). Greater increases in turfgrass color are usually associated with increased plant growth regulator application rates and re-application frequency (Stier et al., 1999; Qian and Engelke, 1999). Visual turfgrass quality is a rating frequently used by turfgrass researchers that integrates numerous turfgrass characteristics including color, uniformity, texture, and density (Skogley & Sawyer, 1992). Increased turfgrass quality following TE applications is most likely a function of increased color and tiller density. Repeated TE applications typically enhanced turfgrass color, quality, and tiller density four to eight weeks after initial TE application (McCullough et al., 2006b).

Root Architecture and Nutrient Uptake

The effect of TE on rooting is not as evident as enhancements in color or quality. Generally, few significant differences in root mass or length have been reported during field experiments with TE for both warm and cool season grasses (Ervin and Koski, 2001a; Fagerness and Yelverton, 2001; Goss et al., 2002; Fagerness et al., 2004; Wherley and Sinclair, 2009).

Two notable exceptions include Bingaman et al. (2001) and Qian and Engelke (1999) who found TE increased rooting strength in transplanted Kentucky bluegrass sod, and turfgrass root mass was increased by 50-60% in shade. More commonly, TE is found to decrease root to shoot ratio because tiller density is increased with no effect on turfgrass rooting (Goss et al., 2002; Beasley et al., 2005). Greenhouse experiments with both warm- and cool-season turfgrass have observed changes in root architecture following TE application (Beasley et al., 2005; McCullough et al., 2005; McCullough et al., 2006a). Kentucky bluegrass grown hydroponically had increased root diameter and root surface area following TE application (Beasley et al., 2005). Increased tiller density in that study resulted in no change in Kentucky bluegrass root surface area to shoot ratio, and there was no effect on root length (Beasley et al., 2005). Hybrid bermudagrass root mass was found to increase 23-43% after sequential TE applications in a greenhouse (McCullough et al., 2005; McCullough et al., 2006a). However, increased hybrid bermudagrass root mass has not yet been observed under field conditions.

Trinexapac-ethyl Absorption, Translocations, and Metabolism

Fagerness and Penner (1998a) used ^{14}C labeled TE to investigate absorption and translocation within Kentucky bluegrass. The plant base, crown and leave sheaths, absorbed 80% total applied product within the first hour with maximum absorption (90%) after eight hours. Leaf blades absorbed TE 60% of applied TE after 24 hours with 55% absorbed in the first eight hours. Roots absorbed a negligible amount of TE during the experiment. They concluded that TE is both xylem and phloem mobile although a majority of the TE was translocated to turf foliage.

Fagerness and Penner (1998b) also investigated TE efficacy under different spray parameters on Kentucky bluegrass and creeping bentgrass in a greenhouse. They found the

growth suppression responded linearly with application rate and that species responded differently with maximum regulation occurring 2-3 weeks after TE application regardless of application rate. Sprayer application volume and ultraviolet degradation had a minimal effect on growth inhibition. Mowing height had an effect on clipping suppression as the high height of cut experienced greater relative growth inhibition.

Once in the plant, TE, is metabolized by the series of enzymatic processes (Eerd et al., 2003). Organic pesticides are metabolized in three phases (Hatzios, 1991; Shimabukuro, 1985). During Phase I metabolism, pesticides are transformed from parent compound to primary metabolites through processes including oxidation, reduction, and hydrolysis. During Phase II, the pesticides are conjugated with sugars, amino acids, or glutathione and are stored in cell organelles before further metabolism to secondary conjugates in Phase III. Toxicity and efficacy are reduced from one phase to the next (Eerd et al., 2003). These processes are enzyme mediated reactions and are therefore subject to Michaelis-Menten kinetics (Taiz and Zeiger, 2006).

Researchers have shown rate of metabolism is related to organism mass and increases exponentially with temperature in all living organisms (Hemmingsen, 1960; Kleiber, 1932). Traditionally this relationship is generally described as the Q_{10} and is only valid across a small temperature range at which a majority of biological organisms functions; $[Q_{10}]^{T/10}$ (Gillooly et al., 2001). More recently the idea of universal temperature dependence is used to describe rate of biological processes (Gillooly et al., 2001). This formula relates the Boltzmann factor and body mass to more accurately predict metabolic rate; $B \sim M^{3/4} e^{-E_i/kT}$ where E_i is activation energy, T is temperature ($^{\circ}\text{K}$) and k is the Boltzmann constant. This formula can remove 15% of the error in the Q_{10} across the biologically relevant temperature range of 0-40 $^{\circ}\text{C}$ and is universal for all living organisms (Gillooly et al., 2001).

With knowledge of how temperature affects organism metabolism it's illogical to think that calendar based re-application intervals are efficient. For example, the Primo Maxx label (trade name for a commonly used TE product) states that the 0.05 kg a.i. ha⁻¹ application rate will suppress bentgrass putting green yield for four weeks. However, data in Table 1.1 indicates that the duration of suppression is typically much shorter. Lickfeldt et al. (2001) found decreased TE efficacy as the temperatures increased into summer. A similar effect was seen in hybrid bermudagrass during fall (Fagerness et al., 2002). As the daily average air temperature decreased the duration and magnitude of the suppression period increased. McCullough et al. (2007) indicated that weekly application of TE provided more consistent growth suppression compared to bi- and tri-weekly applications when the total annual amount was constant across all application intervals on a creeping bentgrass putting green.

Beasley and Branham (2005) quantified TE half lives in Kentucky bluegrass and creeping bentgrass. Each species was treated with TE and placed in growth chambers set to constant air temperatures of 18 or 30°C. Plants were then harvested after different amounts of time for each specific temperature for trinexapac acid quantification with HPLC-UV. They found the half live of TE in creeping bentgrass to be 6.4 and 3.1 days for the 18 and 30°C growth chambers, respectively. The half lives at 18 and 30°C were 5.3 and 3.4 days for Kentucky bluegrass, respectively. A two year field study was also conducted with similar findings in Kentucky bluegrass during the summer (Beasley et al., 2007). The authors found that increased application rate had little effect on magnitude or duration of the suppression phase.

Rate of TE metabolism is controlled to a greater extent by temperature and not UV degradation (Beasley and Branham, 2005; Fagerness and Penner 1998b). A logical step forward with this research was to develop a model that used air temperature to optimize TE re-applications. The creation of such a model could have profound impacts on turfgrass growth

and development. It would provide turfgrass managers a tool that could be used to predict both magnitude of growth suppression and when TE would need to be re-applied to maintain the clipping suppression phase. Implications of sustained yield suppression possibly include increased TNC content, color, quality and tiller density. Additionally, sustained yield inhibition would reduce nutrient removal and nutrient demand and may reduce fertility requirements.

REFERENCES

- Beasley, J. S., and B. E. Branham. 2005. Analysis of paclobutrazol and trinexapac acid in turfgrass clippings. *Int. Turfgrass Soc. Res. J.* 10(2):1170-1175.
- Beasley, J. S., B. E. Branham, and L. M. Ortiz-Ribbing. 2005. Trinexapac-ethyl affects kentucky bluegrass root architecture. *HortScience*. 40:1539-1542
- Beasley, J. S., B. E. Branham, and L. A. Spomer. 2007. Plant growth regulators alter Kentucky bluegrass canopy leaf area and carbon exchange. *Crop Sci.* 47:757-766.
- Bingaman, B. R., N. E. Christians, and D. S. Gardner. 2001. Trinexapac-ethyl effects on rooting of Kentucky bluegrass (*Poa pratensis*) sod. *Int. Turfgrass Soc. Res. J.* 9(2):832-834.
- Bunnell, B. T., L. B. McCarty, and W. C. Bridges. 2005. 'TifEagle' bermudagrass response to growth factors and mowing height when grown at various hours of sunlight. *Crop Sci.* 45:575-581.
- Eerd, L.L., R.E. Hoagland, R.M. Zablotowicz, and J.C. Hall. 2003. Pesticide metabolism in plants and microorganism. *Weed Science*. 51:472-495.
- Ervin, E. H., and A. J. Koski. 1998. Growth responses of *Lolium perenne* to trinexapac-ethyl. *Hort Sci.* 33:1200-1202.
- Ervin, E. H., and A. J. Koski. 2001a. Kentucky bluegrass growth responses to trinexapac-ethyl, traffic, and nitrogen. *Crop Sci.* 41:1871-1877.
- Ervin, E. H., and A. J. Koski. 2001. Trinexapac-ethyl increases Kentucky bluegrass leaf cell density and chlorophyll concentration. *HortScience*. 36:87-789.
- Ervin, E.H., and X. Zhang. 2008. Applied physiology of natural and synthetic plant growth regulators on turfgrasses. p.171-200. *In* M. Pessarakli (ed.) *Handbook of turfgrass management and physiology*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Fagerness, M. J., and D. Penner. 1998a. ^{14}C -trinexapac-ethyl absorption and translocation in Kentucky bluegrass. *Crop Sci.* 38:1023-1027.
- Fagerness, M. J., and D. Penner. 1998b. Spray application parameters that influence the growth inhibiting effects of trinexapac-ethyl. *Crop Sci.* 38:1028-1035.
- Fagerness, M. J., and F. H. Yelverton. 2000. Tissue production and quality of 'Tifway' bermudagrass as affected by seasonal application patterns of trinexapac-ethyl. *Crop Sci.* 40:93-497.
- Fagerness, M. J., and F. H. Yelverton. 2001. Plant growth regulator and mowing height effects on seasonal root growth of Penncross creeping bentgrass. *Crop Sci.* 41:901-1905.

- Fagerness, M. J., F. H. Yelverton, D. P. III Livingston, and T. W. Jr. Rufty. 2002. Temperature and trinexapac-ethyl effects on bermudagrass growth, dormancy, and freezing tolerance. *Crop Sci.* 42:853-858.
- Fagerness, M. J., D. C. Bowman, F. H. Yelverton, and T. W. Jr. Rufty. 2004. Nitrogen use in Tifway bermudagrass, as affected by trinexapac-ethyl. *Crop Sci.* 44:595-599.
- Gardner, D. S., and B. G. Wherley. 2005. Growth response of three turfgrass species to nitrogen and trinexapac-ethyl in the shade. *HortScience.* 40:911-1915.
- Gillooly, J.F., J.H. Brown, G.B. West, V.M. Savage, and E.L. Charnov. 2003. Effects of size and temperature on metabolic rate. *Science.* 293:2248-2251.
- Goss, R. M., J. H. Baird, S. L. Kelm, and R. N. Calhoun. 2002. Trinexapac-ethyl and nitrogen effects on creeping bentgrass grown under reduced light conditions. *Crop Sci.* 42:72-479.
- Han, S. W., T. W. Fermanian, J. A. Juvik, and L. A. Spomer. 1998. Growth retardant effects on visual quality and nonstructural carbohydrates of creeping bentgrass. *HortScience.* 33:197-1199.
- Han, S., T. W. Fermanian, J. A. Juvik, and L. A. Spomer. 2004. Total nonstructural carbohydrate storage in creeping bentgrass treated with trinexapac-ethyl. *HortScience.* 39(6):p. 1461-1464.
- Hatzios, K.K. 1991. Biotraformations of herbicides in higher plants. *In* R. Glower and A.J. Cessna, eds. *Environmental Chemistry of Herbicides.* CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Heckman, N. L., G. L. Horst, R. E. Gaussoin, and K. W. Frank. 2001. Storage and handling characteristics of trinexapac-ethyl treated Kentucky bluegrass sod. *HortScience.* 36:1127-1130.
- Heckman, N.L., R.E. Gaissoin, G.L. Horst, and C.G. Elowsky. 2001. Influence of trinexapac-ethyl on respiration of isolated mitochondria. *In* Annual Meetings Abstracts [CD-ROM], ASA, CSSA, SSSA, Madison, WI.
- Hemmingsen, A.M. 1960. Rep. Steno Mem. Hosp. and Nordisk Insulin Laboratorium 9:6
- Johnson, B. J. 1994. Influence of plant growth regulators and mowing on two bermudagrasses. *Agron. J.* 86:805-810.
- Kleiber, M. 1932. Body size and metabolism. *Hilgardia.* 6:315
- Lickfeldt, D. W., D. S. Gardner, B. E. Branham, and T. B. Voigt. 2001. Turfgrass Management: Implications of repeated trinexapac-ethyl applicaitons on kentucky bluegrass. *Agron. J.* 93:1164-1168.

- McCarty, L. B., J. S. Weinbrecht, J. E. Toler, and G. L. Miller. 2004. St. Augustinegrass response to plant growth retardants. *Crop Sci.* 44:1323-1329.
- McCarty, L. B., Murphy, T. R., L. B. McCarty, and F. H. Yelverton. 2005. Turfgrass plant growth regulators. *In* Best Golf Course Management Practices: Construction, Watering, Fertilizing, Cultural Practices, and Pest Management Strategies to Maintain Golf Course Turf with Minimum Environmental Impact. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
- McCullough, P. E., H. Liu, and L. B. McCarty. 2005. Response of six dwarf-type bermudagrasses to trinexapac-ethyl. *HortScience.* 40:460-462.
- McCullough, P. E., H. Liu, L. B. McCarty, T. Whitwell, and J. E. Toler. 2006a. Growth and nutrient partitioning of 'TifEagle' bermudagrass as influenced by nitrogen and trinexapac-ethyl. *HortScience.* 41:453-458.
- McCullough, P. E., H. Liu, L. B. McCarty, and J. E. Toler. 2006b. Ethephon and trinexapac-ethyl influence creeping bentgrass growth, quality, and putting green performance. [Online] *Appl. Turfgrass Sci.* p. [1-7].
- McCullough, P. E., H. Liu, L. B. McCarty, and J. E. Toler. 2007. Trinexapac-ethyl application regimens influence growth, quality, and performance of bermuda grass and creeping bentgrass putting greens. *Crop Sci.* 47:2138-2144.
- Mok, D.W.S., and M.C. Mok. 1994. Cytokinins: Chemistry, Activity, and Function. CRC Press, London.
- Murphy, T.M., L.B. McCarty, and F.H. Yelverton. 2005. Turfgrass growth regulators. *In* L.B. McCarty (Ed.) Best Golf Course Management Practices (2nd ed.) Pearson and Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River NJ.
- Qian, Y. L., M. C. Engelke, M. J. V. Foster, and S. Reynolds. 1998. Trinexapac-ethyl restricts shoot growth and improves quality of 'Diamond' zoysiagrass under shade. *HortScience.* 33:1019-1022.
- Qian, Y. L., and M. C. Engelke. 1999. Influence of Trinexapac-Ethyl on Diamond Zoysiagrass in a shade environment. *Crop Sci.* 39:202-208.
- Rademacher, W. 2000. Growth retardants: effects on gibberellin biosynthesis and other metabolic pathways. *Annu. Rev. Plant Physiol. Plant Mol. Biol.* 51:501-531.
- Reid J.B., and J.J. Ross. 1991. Gibberellin mutants in *Pisum* and *Lathyrus*. P. 40-50. *In* Takahashi et al. (eds.) *Gibberellins*, Springer Verlag, New York.

- Richie, W. E., R. L. Green, and F. Merino. 2001. Trinexapac-ethyl does not increase total nonstructural carbohydrate content in leaves, crowns, and roots of tall fescue. *HortScience*. 36:772-775.
- Shimabukuro, R.H. 1985. Detoxification of herbicides. *In* S.O. Duke (ed) *Weed Physiology*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Skogley, C. R., and C. D. Sawyer. 1992. Field research. *In* Waddington, D. V., Carrow, R. N., and Shearman, R. C. (eds.) *Turfgrass*. Madison, WI: ASA, CSSA, & SSSA.
- Steinke, K., and J. C. Stier. 2003. Nitrogen selection and growth regulator applications for improving shaded turf performance. *Crop Sci*. 43:1399-1406.
- Stier, J.C., J.N. Rogers III, J.R. Crum, and P.E. Rieke. 1999. Effects of flurprimidol on Kentucky bluegrass under reduced irradiance. *Crop Sci*. 39:1423–1430.
- Stier, J. C., and J. N. III Rogers. 2001. Trinexapac-ethyl and iron effects on supina and Kentucky bluegrasses under low irradiance. *Crop Sci*. 41:457-465.
- Taiz, T. and E. Zeiger. 2006. *Plant Physiology*. Sinauer Associates, Inc, Sunderland, Ma.
- Tan, Z. G., and Y. L. Qian. 2003. Light intensity affects gibberellic acid content in Kentucky bluegrass. *HortScience*. 38: 113-116.
- Waltz, F. C. Jr., and T. Whitwell. 2005. Trinexapac-ethyl effects on total nonstructural carbohydrates of field-grown hybrid bermudagrass. *Int. Turfgrass Soc. Res. J.* 10(2):899-903.
- Watschke, T. L., and J. M. DiPaola. 1995. Plant growth regulators: These compounds can help superintendents effectively manage clippings without compromising turf quality and performance. *Golf Course Management*. 63(3): 59-62.
- Wherley, B., and T. R. Sinclair. 2009. Growth and evapotranspiration response of two turfgrass species to nitrogen and trinexapac-ethyl. *HortScience*. 44:2053-2057.