

# ATTACKING FROM WITHIN

The latest method of insecticide application in turf reduces surface residues, doesn't require irrigation and may give you better control at a lower rate.

by Will Perry, managing editor

Imagine a day when you get better control of turf insects from an insecticide application you didn't have to water in, apply at a reduced rate and that offers no headaches about surface residues, drift or runoff. That day is today.

The application method is via high pressure surface injection, which has been called a success by university and commercial researchers in warm- and cool-season climates.

The method itself is not new. Injecting polymers for water absorption, nematodes for thatch reduction and low-salt turf fertilizers has taken place for several years. The principle is this: force the pesticide through the surface layer, as deep as soil compaction or thatch levels dictate, and hit the target directly. By doing so you improve the efficacy of the chemical and avoid the problems associated with the residual of pesticides on the turf/soil surface.

## Researchers laudatory

"I'm more excited about this technique than anything I've seen in a long time," says Auburn University entomologist Pat Cobb, Ph.D. She is one of eight researchers who recently completed testing of an injection system called Injektaspray, developed two years ago by Cross Equipment Co. of Albany, Georgia. (All of the researchers quoted in this story are recalling their experiences with the Injektaspray system.)

RainSaver, Inc. of Walla Walla, Wash., unveiled the RainSaver 960 and 360 (formerly the RainSaver Jr.) last month at the annual Golf Course Superintendents Association of America meeting in Anaheim. Both models can be used for high-powered surface injection of insecticides. The units had been on the market as injection applicators of water-absorbent polymers, live microbe formulas and fertilizers.

The machines differ in that the RainSaver units use a series of thin coulters blades set three inches apart

on a central shaft, which opens the turf. A nozzle immediately behind the coulters directs the material into the open slit.

The Injektaspray system consists of combined low pressure (30 to 40 psi), low-height topical spray application followed by a high pressure (2,000 psi) ground surface injection. These systems may be operated simultaneously or independently, as needed.

The pesticide is injected directly into the soil using straight stream nozzles through holes in a stainless steel shield pan. The depth of the injection ranges from 1/4 to 1 1/2 inches.

Among its most unique aspects is that it doesn't disturb the soil surface, according to the manufacturer.

Harry Niemczyk, Ph.D. at Ohio State University, has been testing both units for Japanese beetle grub control (see related story below). "Subsurface Attack on Grubs".

## Mole cricket control

Cobb, Ciba-Geigy senior field research representative Mac Hammond, and field technician Phillip Coburn conducted two extensive tests of the injection process. They used the Injektaspray system with Dursban, Triumph and diazinon in

# SUBSURFACE TECHNOLOGY IS PROMISING

OSU research shows it's an idea worth pursuing.

by Harry D. Niemczyk, Ph.D., Department of Entomology  
The Ohio State University

Soil-inhabiting turfgrass pests, such as grubs and plant parasitic nematodes, are currently controlled by applying pesticides to the turf surface and then irrigating to move the material to the target. Recent research here has shown that the actual amount of pesticide delivered to the site of pest activity is frequently less than five percent of that applied to the surface. This is especially true in turfgrass situations having 1/2 inch or more of thatch. (Immediate post-treat-

ment irrigation generally delivers enough pesticide to control the target pest.)

Because of this disparity, recommended effective rates for pesticides are set higher than that actually needed at the site of pest activity. This compensates for the relative immobility of the material.

## What if?

What if the amount of pesticide actually needed to control the pest could

**TABLE 1****MOLE CRICKET CONTROL IN BERMUDAGRASS**

Treatment	Rate Lb ai/a	Pretreat	Mean Number of mole crickets per flush* (% control)	
			25 Days Posttreat	50 Days Posttreat
<b>DURSBAN* 50W 350 psi injection</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>0 (100%)</b>	<b>0 (100%)</b>
<b>DURSBAN microencapsulated</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>0.2 ( 9.6%)</b>	<b>1.0 ( 8.2%)</b>
<b>DURSBAN 50W + Entice</b>	<b>2 + 2 qts</b>	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.5 ( 91%)</b>	<b>1.5 ( 72%)</b>
<b>Oftanol</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>1.7 ( 67%)</b>	<b>3.3 ( 36%)</b>

\*Mole crickets flushed in 2' x 2' quadrant; two flushes per replicate, three replicates per treatment.

Source: Wayne Currey, Ph.D.

Mobile and Eufala, Ala., on mole crickets.

Cobb says she got "very satisfactory" control of mole crickets with the injection process. She adds that initial data suggests control with reduced rates of Dursban 2E and Triumph 4E,

though additional data is still needed.

"From the environmental standpoint, the fact that you don't need to irrigate these chemicals into the soil is of great importance," says Hammond. "The potential for runoff, leaching and exposure to birds or other ani-

mals and humans is virtually eliminated by applying the material by injection."

Hammond adds that pesticides traditionally hampered by being quickly bound to organic matter, such as chlorpyrifos pesticides (Dursban), may perform better when injected.

Hammond expects to conduct future tests with diazinon. Cobb is planning to conduct additional tests of subsurface injection for grub control this spring in Massachusetts.

Wayne Currey, Ph.D., formerly with the University of Florida, tested Dursban by injecting it over an eight-week period at 300 to 400 lbs./psi in Florida with a walk-behind unit at 3/4 to 1 inch penetration for mole cricket control. "The injection method was the only method tested that gave us 100 percent control of the mole cricket problem," says Currey (see table 1).

**Protecting the market**

If early indications are correct that subsurface injection of pesticides allows turf managers to use them at a lower rate, several researchers feel the industry will have greater success protecting the chemicals currently on

See Injection page 66

be delivered directly to the pest's zone of habitation and activity? Such a system of delivery should result in substantial reductions in the amount of material applied to the surface. At the same time, this would have the effect of reducing surface residues to very low levels.

Two systems for subsurface placement of insecticide for control of grubs were evaluated in 1987. The test insecticides, Triumph 4E and Dursban 4E, were applied at 2 lb. active ingredient/acre to a golf course fairway with no thatch at Canal Fulton, Ohio, and one at Wooster, Ohio, having 1/2 to 1 inch of dense thatch.

In cooperation with Ciba-Geigy Corp., a high-pressure injection spray unit, the HPI-2000, manufactured by the Cross Equipment Co. of Albany, Ga., was used to apply the two test insecticides. The unit consisted of a dragging boom with 18 nozzles at intervals of 3 inches that delivered 13 gallons of spray per acre at a nozzle pressure of 1,800 psi.

The RainSaver Jr. (RS), manufactured by Clearwater Industries and made available through Rain Saver, Inc., Walla Walla, Wash., was also

See OSU on page 66

**TABLE A****Subsurface placement of insecticides for control of Japanese beetle larvae in golf course turfgrass.**

Treatment <sup>1</sup>	Rate lb AI/A	Method of Application	Post- Treatment Irrigation	Mean % Control	
				Wooster <sup>2</sup> (thatch)	Canal Fulton <sup>3</sup> (no thatch)
<b>TRIUMPH 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Conv. spray</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>DURSBAN 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>Conv. spray</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>DURSBAN 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>HPI-2000</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>DURSBAN 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>RainSaver Jr.</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>TRIUMPH 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>HPI-2000</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>TRIUMPH 4E</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>RainSaver Jr.</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>82</b>

<sup>1</sup> Treatments applied September 9, 1988, replicated 3X and evaluated October 4, 1988 (34 days posttreatment).

<sup>2</sup> Check population = 6.9 grubs/ft<sup>2</sup>; thatch-mat = 1 inch.

<sup>3</sup> Check population = 24.2 grubs/ft<sup>2</sup>; no thatch.

Source: Harry Niemczyk, Ph.D.



## INJECTION from page 65

the market—and perhaps returning products that have been banned.

"It's possible that if we can document the reduced surface toxicity by injecting these materials, it could go a long way toward bringing products like diazinon (which was banned for use on sod farms and golf courses by the Environmental Protection Agency last April) back into the marketplace," says Hammond.

"I think this system may help us keep a lot of the products available today on the market," adds Currey. "I think if we were able to get our research under way earlier and got to work with diazinon, we might still be able to use it."

### Easier application

"If you have a high pressure injection unit, it pretty much negates the need to water these materials in," says Randy Hudson, Ph.D. at the University of Georgia, who was the first to use and introduce high pressure liquid injection. His data (some of which is presented in table 2) were collected with Ciba-Geigy's Hammond.

"I think the greatest and most important aspect of this application method is the reduced chance for surface exposure after application," says Hudson. "With it we can put a material out there and not have to worry



**Cross Equipment's Injektaspray system has a low-height, low-pressure topical spray followed by a high-pressure ground surface injection.**

about a child or somebody's pet getting poisoned from pesticide on the surface of the lawn."

### Tensile strength remains

Ray Dickens, Ph.D. at Auburn University, Cobb, Hudson and Hammond report that their observations are that the Injektaspray system does not damage the tensile strength of sod. "You don't see that you've done anything," says Currey.

Last season one of Alabama's oldest courses, The Country Club of Mobile, became one of the first courses in the country to use high pressure injection of pesticides on its

fairways. Shull Vance, course superintendent for 17 years, used Dursban at 2 lb. ai/acre and reported an "excellent" kill with a single application.

"We've tried all the recommended chemicals: diazinon, Dursban, Oftanol and baits, everything. But nothing ever lasted the whole season before. With this system we were able to contract the work out and free up our people," says Vance.

At a cost of \$40 an acre, Vance contracted with Hendrix & Dial, Inc. of Tifton, Ga., to inject Dursban on the course's 98 acres of Bermudagrass fairways. The process took three days and did not damage the turf, says Vance. However, the streaks it leaves behind make it impracticable for use on greens for aesthetic reasons, he says.

"The problem with chemicals now is that they break down so rapidly. If the mole crickets don't come up (to the surface) on the night of the application, it's gone. It's like fishing; you don't always catch them," says Vance. "With this system though, you get right at them with a single application."

Only one fairway, which typically undergoes a severe infestation of mole crickets, required a repeat application, says Vance, who used to apply

*Injection from page 68*

## OSU from page 65

used to apply the test insecticides to the above two sites. For the test, the unit's coulters were adjusted so the insecticide depth of  $\frac{1}{2}$  to  $\frac{3}{4}$  inch below the surface. The unit was calibrated to deliver a volume of 132 gallons of spray per acre.

The HPI and RS systems were compared to the standard method of applying liquid insecticides for grub control, namely, treatment followed by irrigation. Both Triumph and Dursban were applied at a volume of 4 gallons of spray per 1,000 sq. ft (174 gallons per acre) and immediately irrigated with  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch of water (i.e., zero time elapsed between application and irrigation).

### Residues and control

To compare residues remaining on the grass blades following treatment, samples of grass were collected from each treatment on the day of application. Plots receiving conventional sprays were sampled before and after irrigation, while those treated with the HPI and RS systems were sampled immediately after application. Residues were extracted within three hours after collection and analyzed by



**The RainSaver Jr. opens the turf with coulters before material is sprayed in.**

gas chromatography within three days.

Effectiveness of the treatments for control of Japanese beetle grubs was determined 34 days following treatment.

In areas with no thatch, HPI was best with 69 percent control. The conventional system gave 26 percent control and RS 72 percent control. At Wooster, all three systems registered low control levels. Control with RS was best (48 percent), which was a substantial improvement over the conventional system (5 percent) in turf with thatch.

The conventional method provided better control with Triumph in

turf with thatch than either HPI or RS. Control from the conventional method in turf without thatch was 87 percent and 82 percent with HPI and RS.

### Thatch penetration

In order to obtain insight into the depth of penetration achieved by the RS and HPI systems, both machines were loaded with a solution of blue dye and application made to the Wooster fairway with thatch. The HPI left clearly visible amounts of dye on the turf surface, while the amount remaining after application with RS was nearly imperceptible.

A cross-section of the turf treated with HPI revealed penetration of only  $\frac{1}{4}$  inch into the thatch. Examination of the slit made by the RS coulters showed dye distribution to the soil level as well as on the entire depth of the thatch.

The RS and HPI were loaded with water and application made to two bentgrass putting greens at Canal Fulton. Both systems left only thin lines of penetration on the green, leaving the surface virtually unchanged for putting.

Irrigation following the conventional method provided better control with Triumph in

*OSU from page 68*



## TABLE 2

### THE EFFECT OF CONVENTIONAL SPRAY APPLICATION AND HIGH PRESSURE LIQUID INJECTION (HPLI) ON MOLE CRICKET POPULATIONS IN TURF.

MATERIAL	RATE LBS. AI/Ac	METHOD	WEEKS POST-TREATMENT MOLE CRICKET TUNNELS/18 SQ. FT.			
			1 wk	2 wk	3 wk	4 wk
Triumph 4.0	2.0	CONV.	2.5b	1.3b	1.8c	5.8b
Triumph 4.0	2.0	HPLI	2.8b	1.0b	1.5c	3.3b
Diazinon 4.0	4.0	CONV.	7.0ab	9.5a	9.5ab	11.5a
Diazinon 4.0	4.0	HPLI	3.5b	4.0b	6.3b	7.8ab
Check	—	—	9.8a	11.5a	11.8a	12.5a

Data analyzed using Duncan's MRT

Source: Randall D. Hudson, Ph.D.

pesticides as many as four or five times a season. Mole crickets were killed when they returned to the site in the days following the application, says Vance.

Other companies Vance contacted

about contracting Injektaspray applications included Turf Control, Inc. of Thomasville, Ga. and O'Hearne Farms, Inc. of Auburn, Ala.

Hard data on the efficacy of insecticides applied via subsurface injec-

tion at a lower rate has yet to be published. But Vance plans on reducing by half his Dursban application this year. This notion is shared by Currey, who says "With the injection system you could probably get by with reduced rates, but we haven't researched that yet. I would surmise that you could, based on what we've seen, in light of the rates we applied."

Doug Houseworth, Ph.D., is manager of technical support at Ciba-Geigy's Turf and Ornamental Department. He has been studying subsurface application for two years. He is convinced that the increased efficacy achieved by injecting the pesticide will give the lawn care operator (LCO) adequate insect control at a reduced cost.

"From our research, it appears we can substantially decrease the chemical rate," says Houseworth. "We feel that this is a way we can reduce the environmental safety hazards that are present in many lawn care insecticides.

"And it's not going to take people long to figure out that they can save a heck of a lot of money by using reduced rates of chemicals. Money that they can put toward the purchase of the necessary equipment." **LM**

## Olathe SLIT SEEDERS/DETHATCHERS for turf professionals

With Olathe Slit Seeders you: • use less seed • get higher germination rates • have a healthier root system • thin out thatch and undesirable species • provide safer turf for sport areas • achieve the most important goal in over-seeding, namely, seed to soil contact.



MODEL 85 — 5 hp Seed 'n Thatch, low cost combination thatcher/seeders.



MODEL 84 walk-behind slit seeder, 18 hp, self propelled.

MODEL 37/38 for tractors in 16-25 hp range, bare dirt capabilities with dual feed hopper.

MODEL 83/93 — 4' PTO model for tractors 25 hp and up. In 1962, Buck Rogers built the first Rogers Slit Seeder. Now, in 1989, he has improved and expanded on his original ideas under the Olathe trademark.

Write or call your local Olathe/Toro dealer for information.

**OLATHE MANUFACTURING, INC.**  
100 INDUSTRIAL PARKWAY, INDUSTRIAL AIRPORT, KANSAS 66031

**800-255-6438**  
FAX: 913-764-1473 913-782-4396



Circle No. 160 on Reader Inquiry Card