ALFORD, CRAIG M.*, AND STEPHEN D. MILLER, Department of Plant Sciences, University of Wyoming, Laramie, WY 82071. Comparison of desmedipham/phenmedipham formulations in sugarbeets.

ABSTRACT

Oil-based formulations of Betamix (AE Bo 38584) and Progress (AE Bo 49913) have been developed as a possible replacement for current formulations of Betamix (desmedipham/phenmedipham) and Progress (desmedipham/phenmedipham/ethofumasate). The new formulations have been developed because of concerns with continuing registration of the current formulations of Betamix, Progress and the emulsifiers that they contain. Additionally these new formulations may eliminate the need to add methylated seed oils (MSO) to the tank mix in a micro-rate herbicide program.

A field study was conducted at the Research and Extension Center, Torrington; Wyoming to compare the effectiveness of the oil based formulations to the conventional formulations when applied as the standard or micro-rate treatments. Plots were established in a RCB design with 3 replicates. Beta 4546 LL sugarbeets were planted to stand (68,000 seed/A) on April 18, 2000. Applications were initiated at the cotyledon stage and continued 7 and 14 days later. All treatments were applied with a CO_2 pressurized knapsack sprayer delivering 20 gpa at 40 psi.

Initial stands were reduced 15 to 26% in all herbicide treatments. Weed control was similar between the standard and oil-based formulations. Slightly more injury was observed with oil based formulations with AE Bo 38584 providing the greatest injury. In the mirco-rate programs weed control was equal with all formulations, and adding MSO to the oil based formulations did not add to the weed control obtained. With Betamix, the standard treatment provided the highest yields, and adding MSO to AE Bo 38584 resulted in greater injury and less yield. While with Progress treatments, AE Bo 49913 with MSO provided the highest yields and slightly higher injury than comparable treatments. All herbicide treatments in the experiment yielded better than the weedy check, but less than the hand weeded check. Yield increases were closely correlated to weed control ($R^2=0.82$).

Intransmitten to sell to 100. The actual values for these effects, supplied by the producer in the reportation reduction are used to calculate the deviation from 100. As an example, the initions while for registration of a product is a concentration to surface extend 0.1 mg/l of word. This scarous value is 100.1% a cartain product its a probable concentration of 0.5 the vector is 30 and if the entitated concentration in 2.0 mg/l the score is 2000. The entres are more that treatment, which means that the values for comparement of 0.05 the extension per treatment, which means that the values for comparement of and united are carted per treatment, which means that the values for comparement of each united are each a maximum of 100 per environmental characterizes a regarded as a corrected of for the score include any finance of the president of an interview of the score is so and be president of the president of a maximum of the score in the initial value for registration in the future will require values of 100 or leas, a tendo with a maximum of 100 per environmental characterizes are regarded as a corrected of the function for the contacterized and the score in the score in the second of the corrected of the president of the second of the score of the score for the score of the registration of the registration of the score of the second of the second of the score of the score of the score of the the score of the second of the second of the score of the

to the recommunication for crop protocoust in the biomethods the scoring system is used to economicate to farmers the extent the products they estend to apply an contributing to an environmental contactunation. In a restricted number of cases rotatiers of e.g. polatoes and regeodoles are acking procens to use only crop protection product and estimates with scores lower than 100 per managest.