

This Journal of Environmental Horticulture article is reproduced with the consent of the Horticultural Research Institute (HRI – <u>www.hriresearch.org</u>), which was established in 1962 as the research and development affiliate of the American Nursery & Landscape Association (ANLA – <u>http://www.anla.org</u>).

HRI's Mission:

To direct, fund, promote and communicate horticultural research, which increases the quality and value of ornamental plants, improves the productivity and profitability of the nursery and landscape industry, and protects and enhances the environment.

The use of any trade name in this article does not imply an endorsement of the equipment, product or process named, nor any criticism of any similar products that are not mentioned.

Weed Management with Fluazifop (Fusilade), Haloxyfop (Verdict), Sethoxydim (Poast) and Oxyfluorfen (Goal) in Groundcovers and Woody Landscape Plants¹

C. Benjamin Coffman and J. Ray Frank^{2,3}

U.S. Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service Beltsville Agricultural Research Center Beltsville, MD 20705

Abstract

Annual preemergence applications of granular Goal (oxyfluorfen) [2-chloro-1-(3-ethoxy-4-nitrophenoxy)-4-(trifluoromethyl) benzene] at 4.5 kg/ha (4.0 lb/A) were applied on several kinds of woody landscape plants alone or with a subsequent postemergence treatment of either Fusilade (fluazifop) $[(\pm)-2-[4-[[5-(trifluoromethyl)-2-pyridinyl]oxy]phenoxy]propanoic acid], Verdict (haloxyfop) [2-[4-[[3-chloro-5-(trifluoromethyl)-2-pyridinyl]oxy]phenoxy]propanoic acid] or Poast (sethoxydim) [2-[1-(ethoxyimino)butyl]-5-[2-(ethylthio)propyl]-3-hydroxy-2-cyclohexen-1-one] at 0.3 kg/ha (0.25 lb/A) or 0.6 kg/ha (0.5 lb/A). The postemergence treatments were also applied without previous applications of Goal. The investigation was conducted at Beltsville, Maryland, from 1983 through 1985. Application of Goal (oxyflurofen) alone reduced the yearly growth of broadleaf and grass weeds, however, over-time horseweed ($ *Conyza canadensis*(L.) Cronq.) and white heath aster (*Aster pilosus*Willd.) increased their contribution to the weed cover. Annual grass weeds including fall panicum (*Panicum dichotomiflorum*Michx.), large crabgrass (*Digitaria sanguinalis*(L.) Scop.), giant foxtail (*Seteria faberi*Herrm.), and stinkgrass (*Eragrostis cilianensis*(All.) E. Mosher) were significantly reduced by applications of Fusilade, Verdict, and Poast. Weed cover reductions up to 60% resulted from treatments by Goal followed by any one of the three grass herbicides. Hinocrimson azalea was injured by applications of Fusilade at 0.3 kg/ha (0.25 lb/A) and Verdict at 0.6 kg/ha (0.5 lb/A).

Index words: Granular herbicide, postemergence herbicide, grass control

Introduction

The quality of woody landscape and groundcover species in permanent and production environments is enhanced by the absence of weeds. Presently used systems for weed management are frequently time consuming and costly.

Postemergence grass herbicides have been investigated alone and in combination with broadleaf herbicides for efficacy and tolerance by landscape and groundcover species (2, 3, 6, 12). A 2-year investigation of preemergence applications of granular Goal (Oxyfluorfen) followed by postemergence spray applications of Poast (Sethoxydim) resulted in 80% reduction of weeds with no injury to established landscape plants (6). Ahrens (1) reported that conifer seedbeds tolerated applications of Poast, Fusilade (Fluazifop), and Verdict (Haloxyfop) at rates that controlled weedy grasses. A number of researchers (9, 10, 12) also reported satisfactory tolerance by landscape plants to postemergence grass herbicides. Selected varieties of flowering annuals (11) and gladiolus (3) were also tolerant of herbicidal rates of Poast and Fusilade. Timing of herbicide applications may result in more effective and less costly weed control. Chernicky (5) reported that young grass plants were more susceptible than older plants to applications of Poast, whereas Buhler and Burnside (4) found that Fusilade and Verdict possessed residual herbicidal activity.

¹Received for publication December 29, 1986; in revised form February 26, 1987.

²Research Agronomist and Weed Scientist, resp.

³Mailing address: USDA-ARS, Fort Detrick, Bldg. 1301, Frederick, MD 21701.

The objectives of this investigation were to characterize responses of; (1) grass and broadleaf weeds, and (2) seven landscape and groundcover species, to applications of Goal, Fusilade, Verdict, and Poast, applied alone and in selected combinations.

Materials and Methods

Field investigations were conducted at Beltsville, in 1983, on a Keyport silt loam (Aquic Hapludult), and continued through 1985. One to 3-year old nursery stock were transplanted into a clean cultivated field in the spring of 1983. Two plants each of the following seven species were planted on 1.2 m (3 ft) centers in each plot: Low-fast cotoneaster (Cotoneaster dammerii Schneid.), Hinocrimson azalea (Rhododendron x Hinocrimson), Andorra juniper (Juniperus horizontalis 'Plumosa' Rehd.), Hicks yew (Taxus media 'Hicksii' Rehd.), periwinkle (Vinca minor L.), Japanese spurge (Pachysandra terminalis Sieb. and Zucc.), and English ivy (Hedera helix L.). Plots were 3 x 11 m (10 x 36 ft). The experimental design was a randomized complete block with all treatments including controls replicated three times. Controls included an unweeded treatment and a monthly handweeded treatment. Fertilizer adequate for plant growth and development was incorporated prior to transplanting. Mean soil pH was 5.6. Plots were hand hoed weed-free each spring prior to herbicide applications. Irrigation was provided as needed.

A single treatment of 1 or 2% granular Goal was applied each spring at 4.5 kg/ha (4.0 lb/A) ai to weed-free plots, using a hand held spinner spreader. All plants were actively growing at time of application. Applica-

tion dates were July 1, 1983, June 11, 1984, and June 1, 1985. After Goal was applied rain occurred 3, 7, and 4 days [0.4 cm (0.15 in), 2.0 cm (0.8 in and 3.2 cm (1.2 in)] in 1983, 1984, 1985. Goal was applied alone as the only preemergence herbicide treatment or followed later by postemergence applications of Fusilade, Verdict, or Poast. Fusilade and Verdict were applied at 0.3 and 0.6 kg/ha (0.25 and 0.5 lb/A), whereas, Poast was applied at 0.3 kg/ha (0.25 lb/A) only. The postemergence treatments were also applied alone without previous Goal applications. Postemergence treatments were applied when grasses were approximately 25 to 35 cm (10 to 14 in) tall using a bicycle mounted boom sprayer at 207 kPa (30 psi) with #8004 flat fan nozzles, in a final volume of 374 L/ha (40 gpa). These treatments were applied on July 31, July 19, and July 31 in 1983, 1984, and 1985. Rainfall occurred 3, 2, and 0 days after herbicide application at 0.4 cm (0.15 in), 2.4 cm (0.95 in) and 1.0 cm (0.4 in) in 1983, 1984, 1985, respectively. Crop oil concentrate containing 85% paraffin base petroleum oil and 15% surfactant blend was mixed with all postemergence grass herbicides at 1% v/v.

Percent weed cover and major weed species and classifications were estimated each fall. Test plants were rated for phytotoxicity on a scale of 0 to 10, with 0 = no effect and 10 = plant death. Values greater than three reflect nonmarketable plants. Plant growth was documented by height and width measurements. Statistical analyses were accomplished by analysis of variance procedures and appropriate mean comparison tests. Mean comparison tests (FLSD) were done only when there was a significant F test.

Table 1. Major weed species in experimental plots at Beltsville, 1983 to 1985.

Dicots	Monocots
Common dandelion Taraxacum officinale Weber Common lambsquarters Chenopodium album L. Common ragweed Ambrosia artemisiifolia L. Corn cockle Agrostemma githago L. Curley dock Rumex crispus L. Hemp dogbane Apocynum cannabinum L. Horseweed Conyza canadensis (L.) Cronq. Knawel Scleranthus annuus L. Pennsylvania smartweed Polygonum pensylvanicum L. Smallflower galinsoga Galinsoga parviflora Cav. Rough fleabane Erigeron strigosus Muhl. Virginia copperleaf Acalypha virginica L. White heath aster Aster pilosus Willd. Yellow rocket Barbarea vulgaris L.	Fall panicum Panicum dichotomiflorum Michx. Giant foxtail Setaria faberi Herrm. Goosegrass Eleusine indica (L.) Gaertn. Large crabgrass Digitaria sanguinalis (L.) Scop. Stinkgrass Eragrostis cilianensis (All.) E. Mosher Yellow nutsedge Cyperus esculentus L.

Table 2. Percent contribution to weed cover of annual grass, annual broadleaf and perennial broadleaf weeds in established landscape and groundcover plots.^z

	Rate		Annual broadleaf			Perennial broadleaf			Annual grass		
Treatment	kg/ha	(lb/A)	1983	1984	1985	1983	1984	1985	1983	1984	1985
							%				
Untreated control			5cde	11de	13ns	6cd	13cd	11bcd	89a	74a	64a
Fusilade	0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	13bcd 18ab	28abc 29ab	17 24	13bc 21ab	19bc 31ab	12bcd 25abc	53bc 44bcd	40b 21bc	43ab 18bcd
Goal followed by Fusilade	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	9cde	16b-e	15	3cd	1de	10cd	41cd	1c	1d
	4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	4cde	11de	15	7cd	4de	16bcd	24cde	0c	0d
Goal	4.5	(4.0)	3de	12cde	24	2d	3de	14bcd	75ab	37b	32bc
Verdict	0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	15abc 24a	40a 43a	19 29	22a 12bc	36a 34a	39a 19bcd	51bc 54bc	13c 2c	9cd 0d
Goal followed by Verdict	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	6cde	7de	16	8cd	4de	11cd	32cde	3c	1d
	4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	12bcd	16de	15	7cd	4de	24abc	30cde	0c	0d
Poast	0.3	(0.25)	18ab	22bcd	14	25a	30ab	30ab	29cde	40b	26bcd
Goal followed by Poast	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	4de	12de	24	7de	6de	13bcd	19de	5c	4cd

²Within columns, values followed by same letter or letters are not significantly different at 5% level according to FLSD mean comparison test; ns = no significant differences.

Results and Discussion

Percent weed cover. Major weeds occurring throughout the investigation are shown in Table 1. Estimated contributions of annual grass, annual broadleaf and perennial broadleaf weeds to total weed cover are presented in Table 2. No perennial grasses were observed during this investigation. Yellow nutsedge, which occurred in several treatments $\leq 5\%$ was included in the annual grass estimate.

Annual grass weeds dominated the untreated control plots and restricted establishment of annual and perennial broadleaf weeds (Table 2). Annual and perennial broadleaf weeds made their largest contribution to weed cover in plots that received only Fusilade, Verdict or Poast (Tables 2 and 3). Preemergence treatments of Goal alone resulted in annual reduction of all weeds, although annual and perennial broadleaf weeds generally increased their contribution to weed cover from 1983 to 1985 as annual grass weeds decreased. However, specific broadleaf species such as curly dock, common lambsquarters and smallflower galinsoga tended to decrease their contribution to overall weed cover with the inclusion of Goal in the herbicide treatment. On the other hand, white heath aster and horseweed did not consistently respond to herbicide treatments, and increased in contribution to weed cover from 1983 to 1985.

Annual grass weeds were reduced more by treatments with Verdict alone than by treatments with Fusilade or Poast alone, in 1984 and 1985 (Table 2). This probably resulted from Verdict's residual activity and consequent ability to control annual grass weeds that germinated after herbicide applications. Large crabgrass was controlled 1.5 times more effectively with Verdict than with either Fusilade or Poast. Both Verdict and Fusilade controlled stinkgrass 4.5 times more effectively than Poast. Fall panicum and giant foxtail were equally well controlled by all three grass herbicides.

Combinations of Goal with any of the three grass herbicides resulted in lower weed covers than those obtained with any herbicide applied alone (Table 3). These weed cover reductions should result in approximately 60% savings in labor needed for weed control during the growing season.

Plant Growth. There were no significant differences in growth of periwinkle, Japanese spurge, and English ivy from 1983 to 1985. Of these 3 species, only English ivy growth differed significantly among treatments. English ivy plants in herbicide treated plots grew significantly more (64%) than those in unweeded control plots (data not shown).

There were no significant treatment effects on the growth of cotoneaster, juniper, yew, and azalea. However, all four species grew significantly from 1983 to 1985 (data not shown).

Generally the landscape species tolerated all herbicide treatments for the duration of the investigation (phytotoxicity values $< 3.0; \ge 3.0$ commercially unacceptable). However, in 1984 and 1985 Hinocrimson azalea appeared to be intolerant of Verdict applications at 0.6 kg/ha (0.5 lb/A) (Table 4). Injury included leaf discoloration and leaf loss, combined with reduced plant vigor and commercially unacceptable regrowth. A similar response was observed when Goal was followed by Verdict in 1985. Earlier research by several workers (2, 7, 8) reported injury to Hinocrimson azalea by Fusilade applications. In 1985, Hinocrimson azalea was apparently injured by application of Fusilade at 0.6 kg/ha (0.5 lb/A), and by combinations of Goal and Fusilade at 0.3 kg/ha (0.25 lb/A) (Table 4), although there were no phytotoxic responses in 1983 and 1984. Combinations of factors in 1985 may have contributed to the

Table 3. Percent contribution to weed cover of annual grass, annual broadleaf, and perennial broadleaf weeds, combined and averaged over 3 years and total weed cover per year, in established landscape and groundcover plants.^z

	Rate		Annual	Perennial	Annual			
Treatment	kg/ha	(lb/A)	broadleaf	broadleaf	grass	1983	1984	1985
Untreated Control			10d	10de	76a	100a	98a	88a
Fusilade	0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	19bc 24ab	14cd 26ab	45bc 29de	78a-d 83abc	88a 82a	72ab 67ab
Goal followed by Fusilade	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	13cd	5ef	14e-h	53b-f	18cd	25cd
	4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	10d	9de	8gh	35ef	15cd	32cd
Goal	4.5	(4.0)	13cd	6ef	48b	81a-d	53b	70ab
Verdict	0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	25ab 32a	32a 21bc	24def 19d-g	88ab 90ab	90a 78a	67ab 48bc
Goal followed by Verdict	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	10d	7def	12fgh	45def	13cd	28cd
	4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	14cd	12de	10fgh	48c-f	20cd	38bc
Poast	0.3	(0.25)	18bcd	28ab	32cd	72a-f	92a	70ab
Goal followed by Poast	4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	14cd	9de	9fgh	30fg	23c	42bc

^zWithin columns, values followed by same letter or letters are not significantly different at 5% level according to FLSD mean comparison test.

Table 4	Phytotoxicity ratings ² of Hinocrimson azalea to herbicide treatments applied annually over a 3-year	period.	y
Table 4.	Phytotoxicity ratings ² of Hinocrimson azalea to herbicide treatments applied annually over a 5-year p		

	te	1983	1984	1985				
kg/ha	(lb/A)							
		1.2ns	0.3b	2.7ns				
		0.8	0.0b	1.2				
0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	0.1 1.0	0.0b 0.0b	3.3 3.0				
4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	0.7	0.0b	5.2				
4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	0.1	0.0b	2.5				
4.5	(4.0)	1.0	0.2b	2.8				
0.3 0.6	(0.25) (0.5)	1.4 1.2	0.0b 4.2a	2.7 4.5				
4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	0.0	1.3b	0.5				
4.5 0.6	(4.0) (0.5)	0.0	1.5b	4.7				
0.3	(0.25)	2.3	0.5b	2.3				
4.5 0.3	(4.0) (0.25)	0.2	0.0b	0.2				
				comparison test: ns =				
action of letters are i	ist significantly u							
	•							
2) sensitization	of the flu	azifop-butyl and setho						
the herbicides.	co	rm yield of a planting of	four varieties of Gla	diolus cormels by pos				
Significance to the Nursery Industry				emergence applications of fluazifop-butyl or sethoxydin and preemer- gence applications of napropamide and oryzalin. Proc. Northeast.				
	$\begin{array}{c} \\ 0.3 \\ 0.6 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.3 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.6 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.3 \\ 0.6 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.3 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.3 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.3 \\ 4.5 \\ 0.3 \\ \end{array}$ here 0 = no injury, eletter or letters are r	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	1.2ns0.80.3(0.25)0.10.6(0.5)1.04.5(4.0)0.70.3(0.25)4.5(4.0)0.10.6(0.5)4.5(4.0)1.00.3(0.25)1.40.6(0.5)1.24.5(4.0)0.00.3(0.25)1.40.6(0.5)1.24.5(4.0)0.00.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.34.5(4.0)0.20.3(0.25)2.3h azalea to treatmentsNortheast. Weed Sci. Soc.2. Sing, A. and M. Macfluazifop-butyl and sethor5ci. Soc. 38:251-252.3. Bind, A., A.F. Seneerorm yield of a planting ofemergence applications of	1.2ns0.3b0.80.0b0.3(0.25)0.10.0b0.6(0.5)1.00.0b4.5(4.0)0.70.0b0.3(0.25)4.5(4.0)0.10.0b0.6(0.5)4.5(4.0)1.00.2b0.3(0.25)1.40.0b0.6(0.5)1.24.2a4.5(4.0)0.01.3b0.3(0.25)4.5(4.0)0.01.5b0.6(0.5)4.5(4.0)0.01.5b0.6(0.5)0.3(0.25)2.30.5b4.5(4.0)0.20.0b0.3(0.25)2.30.5b4.5(4.0)0.20.0b0.3(0.25)2.30.5b4.5(4.0)0.20.0b0.3(0.25)h azalea to treatments se factors include (1) (2) sensitization of the th the same herbicide, o the herbicides.Northeast. Weed Sci. Soc. 39:243-246. 2. Bing, A. and M. Macksel. 1984. Posteme fluazifop-butyl and sethoxydim in azaleas. P Sci. Soc. 38:251-252.3. Bind, A., A.F. Senesac, and M. Mackse corm yield of a planting of four varieties of <i>Gla</i> emergence applications of fluazifop-butyl or se				

Significance to the Nursery Industry

The application of a granular formulation of Goal followed by timely application of either Fusilade, Verdict, or Poast, reduced weed cover in 7 established groundcover and landscape plant species, and reduced the need for hand labor by approximately 60%. In addition, this investigation revealed that Hinocrimson azalea may not be tolerant of annual applications of Verdict and Fusilade. Although Poast applications were successfully tolerated by Hinocrimson azalea, varietal screening should be done prior to annual applications of postemergence grass herbicides for weed management in azalea. Furthermore, granular formulations of Goal are commercially available only in combinations with Prowl (pendimethalin) N-(1-ethylpropyl)-3,4-dimethyl-2,6dinitrobenzenamine or Surflan (oryzalin) 4-(dipropylamino)-3,5-dinitrobenzenesulfonamide.

(Ed note: This paper reports the results of research only, and does not imply registration of a pesticide under amended FIFRA. Before using any of the products mentioned in this research paper, be certain of their registration by appropriate state and/or federal authorities.)

Literature Cited

1. Ahrens, J.F., and M. Cubanski. 1985. Evaluation of postemergence grass herbicides in conifer seedbeds and Christmas trees. Proc. corm yield of a planting of four varieties of Gladiolus cormels by postemergence applications of fluazifop-butyl or sethoxydin and preemergence applications of napropamide and oryzalin. Proc. Northeast. Weed Sci. Soc. 40:254-258.

4. Buhler, D.D., and O.C. Burnside. 1984. Herbicidal activity of fluazifop-butyl, haloxyfop-methyl, and sethoxydim in soil. Weed Sci. 32:824-831.

5. Chemicky, J.P., B.J. Gossett, and T.R. Murphy. 1984. Factors influencing control of annual grasses with sethoxydim or RO-13-8895. Weed Sci. 32:174-177.

6. Coffman, C.B., J.R. Frank, and W.A. Gentner. 1984. Sethoxydim (Poast) and oxyfluorfen (Goal) efficacy and tolerance by landscape plants. J. Environ. Hort. 2:120-122.

7. Frank, J.R., and C.E. Beste, 1986. Postemergence control of 7. Frank, J.R., and C.E. Beste. 1986. Postemergence control of weeds in azalea with sethoxydim and fluazifop. HortScience. 21:1400-1403.

8. Frank, J.R., C.R. Krause, and C.E. Beste. 1987. Effects of $\overset{\circ}{\beta}$ sethoxydim, fluazifop-butyl, and fluazifop-p-butyl on the foliage of Kurume azaleas. J. Environ. Hort. 5:(In press).

9. Haramaki, C. and L.J. Kuhns. 1985. Selected grass herbicides for woody ornamental liners. Proc. Northeast. Weed Sci. Soc. 39:239-242.

10. Haramaki, C. and L.J. Kuhns. 1985. Tolerance of bedding plants to selected grass herbicides. Proc. Northeast. Weed Sci. Soc. 39:231-234.

11. Kuhns, L.J., C. Haramaki, J. Becker, and G. Lyman. 1986. Preemergence and postemergence grass herbicides in annual flowers. Proc. Northeast. Weed Sci. Soc. 40:260-262.

12. Rice, R.P., G. Lewis, and K. Harrell. 1985. Potential of Fusilade, Poast, and CGA-82725 for control of weedy grasses in woody nursery crops and groundcovers. J. Environ. Hort. 3:28-32.