

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Improving the Efficiency of Herbicide Application to Pasture Weeds by Weed- Wiping and Spot-Spraying

A thesis presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Plant Science

At Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

CLYTON MOYO

2008

ABSTRACT

This study investigated methods to reduce herbicide application through improved targeting of weeds, thereby also reducing damage to pastures. The focus was to evaluate and improve wiper and spot-spraying application techniques for pasture herbicides as they reduce chemical use by treating just the weed.

Wiper application of herbicides was shown to be a useful technique for controlling Californian thistles. In one trial, a stem reduction of over 90% when assessed 10 months post application was achieved with a double pass of clopyralid, metsulfuron and glyphosate when the plants were treated at the post-flowering stage and were vigorously growing. A double pass was superior to a single pass for glyphosate and triclopyr/picloram, but not for clopyralid and metsulfuron. Subsequent trials produced poor results possibly because of the stressed condition of the thistles and their growth stage as well as lack of consistency in wiper output and operator differences. Despite wiper applicators usually being selective, some damage to pastures was observed in the field, and from a series of experiments it was concluded that rain falling soon after wiper application was the likely cause of pasture damage.

An innovative and highly sensitive technique using a spectrophotometer was developed to measure herbicide output from wiper applicators. A spectrophotometer could accurately measure clopyralid concentrations as low as 0.02 g active ingredient in a litre of water. The Eliminator and Rotowiper outputs were found to be highly variable while the Weedswiper was more consistent although it applied less herbicide than the other two wipers.

Spot spraying experiments confirmed that glyphosate and metsulfuron create bare patches by damaging both grass and clover while clopyralid and triclopyr/picloram only eliminate clover. However, metsulfuron patches stayed bare for much longer while glyphosate ones quickly filled up with weeds and clover. Ingress of clover stolons appeared to be more important than re-establishment from seed in the recovery of patches. The bigger the damaged patch, the higher the likelihood of re-colonisation by opportunistic weeds. Bioassay studies found that over-application of clopyralid and triclopyr/picloram provided residual activity up to 18 and 30 weeks, respectively, thereby potentially preventing re-establishment of white clover. The negative effects on clover seedlings from metsulfuron ranged from 3 to 6 weeks for

standard and high rates, respectively, with a stimulatory effect on seedlings thereafter for up to 18 weeks.

Dose-response curves for the application of metsulfuron and triclopyr/picloram into the centre 5% versus full plant coverage of Scotch thistle and ragwort rosettes showed that application of herbicide to the centre 5% was as effective at the same concentration and greatly reduced the risk of damage to pasture.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My PhD project would not have been possible without technical, financial and moral support provided by so many people but foremost my Chief Supervisor Dr Kerry Harrington and co-supervisors, Professor Peter Kemp and Dr Han Eerens. Dr Kerry Harrington, thank you for letting me take on the study and for your great supervision, motivation, guidance, advice, patience and your passion for the project to succeed. Dr Han Eerens, thank you for your constructive and critical comments on experimental designs and the project in general and for your efficient editing. To Professor Peter Kemp, your critical advice and generosity in sharing knowledge is invaluable. Three supervisors, all different in their approach, one cant wish for more!

Thanks to the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology for their generous funding of this project through the Outsmarting Weeds (# C10X0318) contract, without which this work would not have been possible. Thanks also to the trustees of Helen E. Akers, New Zealand Plant Protection Society, John Hodgson Pastoral Science and Dan Watkins Weed Science Scholarships for your financial support.

Special thanks to my partners in the project, AgResearch, especially Dr Graeme Bourdot, Dr Anis Rahman and Dr Trevor James for their guidance and enthusiasm. I would also like to express my gratitude to John Lucking formerly of Rotoworks for providing the Rotowiper and technical support. Thanks also to Graeme Gates of C-Dax for providing technical information on the Eliminator. Thanks also to John Maddock of Agtronix and Peter Thomson of Agrispray for information on the Weedswiper. Many thanks also to chemical companies for providing some of the herbicides and especially Dr George Mason for sharing your in-depth knowledge of the pesticide industry.

Many thanks go to so many people for their support and help during my study. To Mark Osborne, Tom Dodd and Peter Jessop, I thank you for your help with my field trials. Special thanks to the statistician, Dr Allistair Noble and Dr James Millner for assistance with design and analysis of experiments.

Thanks to Dr David Woolley and Chris Rawlingson for your advice with the spectrophotometer To Lesley Taylor, Steve Ray and all the staff at Plant Growth Unit, thank you for your help with my glasshouse experiments. To Ruth Morrisson and staff at Seed Technology, Craig McGill and Robert Southward, thank you for your assistance with everyday requirements in the Lab. Special thanks to past and current postgrad students at INR for sharing ideas. Thanks also to France Prevost for help in formatting the document.

Many thanks to my friends, cousins, my brothers and sisters for making me feel proud of my work. My parents, for instilling the value of education in me, I will forever be grateful. To my wife, Maciline, thanks for your love, support and encouragement. Finally, to my daughter Rayirai, my son Tafara and niece Tafadzwa, thanks for bringing back the smile when times were tough.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	ix
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
LIST OF PLATES	xvii
Chapter 1	1
1 Introduction, objectives and thesis structure	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	4
1.3 Thesis structure	5
1.4 References	6
Chapter 2	9
2 Literature Review	9
2.1 Introduction.....	9
2.2 Problems caused by pasture weeds.....	10
2.2.1 Competition	10
2.2.2 Avoidance and reduced utilisation	11
2.2.3 Plants that affect product quality	12
2.2.4 Plants that affect livestock health	12
2.2.5 Allelopathic plants.....	12
2.3 Economics of herbicidal weed control in pastures	13
2.3.1 Economic threshold level.....	13
2.4 Chemical weed control	16
2.4.1 Herbicide application	16
2.4.2 Timing of application.....	17
2.4.3 Herbicides used in New Zealand pastures	18
2.4.3.1 Phenoxy herbicides	18
2.4.3.1 MCPB and 2,4-DB.....	20
2.4.3.2 MCPA and 2,4-D	21
2.4.3.2 Dicamba	22
2.4.3.3 Clopyralid, picloram and triclopyr	23
2.4.3.4 Metsulfuron-methyl.....	24
2.4.3.5 Glyphosate	26
2.5 Herbicide application by wipers	28
2.5.1 Use of weed wipers in pastures.....	28
2.5.2 History and development of herbicide wiper applicators.....	30
2.5.3 Design of early rope-wick and roller applicators	31
2.5.4.1 Rope-wick applicators	31
2.5.4.2 Roller applicators.....	33
2.6 Performance of selective wiper applicators	34
2.6.1 Pressure and gravity.....	34
2.6.2 Number of trips and speed	35
2.6.3 Type of rope and absorbent material.....	36

2.6.4	Herbicide type, concentration and formulation	37
2.6.5	Operator skills	37
2.7	Herbicide applicators used in New Zealand.....	37
2.7.1	Wick boom.....	38
2.7.2	Weedswiper.....	38
2.7.3	Z-Wiper and Eliminator.....	40
2.7.4	Rotowiper	41
2.8	Conclusions	42
2.9	References	43
Chapter 3		55
3 An investigation of factors influencing severity of pasture damage during spot-spraying of herbicides.....		55
3.1	Introduction.....	55
3.2	Materials and methods	57
3.2.1	Study sites.....	57
3.2.2	Soils.....	58
3.2.3	Experimental design.....	58
3.2.4	Pasture production and composition	59
3.2.5	Bioassay.....	60
3.2.6	Data analysis.....	61
3.3	Results.....	61
3.3.1	Untreated control.....	61
3.3.2	Metsulfuron.....	66
3.3.3	Glyphosate	68
3.3.4	Clopyralid and triclopyr/picloram	70
3.3.5	Bioassay.....	71
3.3.5.1	Metsulfuron	71
3.3.5.2	Clopyralid	72
3.3.5.3	Triclopyr/picloram.....	73
3.4	Discussion	74
3.5	Future Research.....	78
3.6	Conclusions.....	78
3.7	References	79
Chapter 4		85
4 Effectiveness of concentrating herbicide application to the centre compared to spraying ragwort (<i>Senecio jacobaea</i>) and Scotch thistle (<i>Cirsium vulgare</i>) rosettes to run-off.....		85
4.1	Introduction.....	85
4.2	Materials and methods	86
4.2.1	Ragwort experiment	86
4.2.2	Scotch thistle experiment	88
4.2.3	Statistical analysis	89
4.3	Results.....	89
4.4	Discussion	92
4.5	Conclusions	94
4.6	References	95
Chapter 5		98
5 Wiper application of herbicides to Californian thistle		98
5.1	Introduction.....	98
5.2	Materials and methods	100

5.2.1	Study sites.....	100
5.2.2	Experiment 1	101
5.2.3	Experiment 2	104
5.2.4	Experiment 3	106
5.2.5	Statistical analysis	107
5.3	Results.....	107
5.3.1	Experiment 1	107
5.3.2	Experiment 2	111
5.3.3	Experiment 3	113
5.4	Discussion	115
5.5	Conclusions	120
5.6	References	121
Chapter 6	126
6	An investigation into the causes of pasture damage from wiper application of herbicides.....	126
6.1	Introduction.....	126
6.2	Materials and methods	129
6.2.1	Experiment 1	129
6.2.2	Experiment 2	130
6.2.3	(a) Experiment 3a.....	131
6.2.4	(b) Experiment 3b.....	134
6.2.5	(c) Experiment 3c.....	135
6.2.6	Experiment 4	135
6.3	Results.....	137
6.3.1	Experiment 1	137
6.3.2	Experiment 2	138
6.3.3	(a) Experiment 3a.....	139
6.3.4	(b) Experiment 3b.....	141
6.3.5	(c) Experiment 3 c	141
6.3.6	Experiment 4	142
6.4	Discussion	148
6.4.1	Rainfall	148
6.4.2	Splattering and dripping.....	150
6.4.3	Exudation	152
6.4.4	Translocation of herbicide from seed heads to daughter tillers	153
6.5	Conclusions	154
6.6	References	155
Chapter 7	160
7	A spectrophotometric technique for measuring herbicide deposition on weeds from wiper applicators	160
7.1	Introduction.....	160
7.2	Method and Materials	162
7.2.1	Preliminary experiments: construction of a standard curve ...	162
7.2.1.1	Deposition of clopyralid on non-absorbent surfaces.....	163
7.2.1.2	Deposition of clopyralid on rushes.....	164
7.2.2	Experiment 1	164
7.2.3	Experiment 2	166
7.2.4	Experiment 3	167
7.3	Results.....	167

7.3.1	PVC strips	167
7.3.2	Rushes	168
7.3.3	Experiment 1	169
7.3.4	Experiment 2	170
7.3.5	Experiment 3	172
7.4	Discussion	175
7.5	Conclusions	179
7.6	References	180
Chapter 8	183
8	General Discussion and Conclusions	183
8.1	Introduction.....	183
8.2	Wiper application of herbicides to weeds.....	184
8.2.1	Weed control	184
8.2.2	Choice of herbicide.....	186
8.2.3	Application rates	188
8.2.4	Choice of weed wiper	189
8.2.5	Moisture Sensors.....	191
8.3	Causes of pasture damage from wiper application of herbicides...	191
8.3.1	Introduction.....	191
8.3.2	Rainfall	192
8.3.3	Herbicides and herbicide formulation	192
8.3.4	Further research	193
8.4	Development of a technique to measure output of herbicides from wiper applicators	194
8.4.1	Introduction.....	194
8.4.2	The potential of the spectrophotometric technique	194
8.4.3	Variability in herbicide output from weed wipers.....	195
8.4.4	Future research	196
8.5	Impact of spot-spraying treatments on pasture plants growing in the vicinity of the target weed.....	196
8.5.1	Introduction.....	196
8.5.2	Herbicide effect	197
8.5.3	Size of patch.....	198
8.5.4	Herbicide recommendations.....	199
8.6	Application of herbicides to the centre of target weeds	200
8.7	Conclusions	201
8.8	References	203

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1 Total rainfall (mm) and average maximum temperatures (°C) for the duration of the experiment	58
Table 4.1 The percentage of metsulfuron-treated plants regenerating from total necrosis 20 weeks after having been classified as totally necrotic..	92
Table 5.1 The herbicides and rates used for the experiment.....	102
Table 5.2 The maximum temperature on the day of application and number of days from day of treatment to the onset of rain.....	105
Table 5.3 The Californian thistle stem density resulting from single and double passes of a Rotowiper applying four herbicides from February 2005 to October 2005.....	108
Table 5.4 Injury scores to pasture grass for a double pass 5 weeks after application of herbicides, where 1 = total mortality and 10 = no effect. Scores with the same letter are not significant.....	110
Table 5.5 The amount of rainfall and the number of days after treatment that it fell. The dates shown represent the time of the field trial with Feb 05 representing Experiment 1, Jan 06 – Apr 06 representing three field trials of Experiment 2, and Feb 07 represents Experiment 3.....	119
Table 6.1 The effect of position around artificial weed on the average amount of herbicide per Petri dish collected from each wiper g (a.i). Means followed by the same letter (in each column) are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$).....	141

Table 7.1 The effect of weed position on the average amount of herbicide (mg ai) collected per “weed” at different moisture levels (low, medium and high).....	170
Table 8.1 Relative cost of herbicides (wiping) used in the trials.	187
Table 8.2 Relative cost of herbicides used for spot-spraying	199

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig 2.1 The structure of 2,4-DB (a) and MCPB (b)	20
Fig 2.2 The structure of (a) MCPA and (b) 2,4-D.....	21
Fig 2.3 The structure of dicamba.....	22
Fig 2.4 The structure of clopyralid (a) picloram (b) and triclopyr(c).....	23
Fig 2.5 The structure of metsulfuron methyl	25
Fig 2.6 The structure of glyphosate	27
Fig 2.7 Transverse rope-wick applicator.....	32
Fig 2.8 Longitudinal rope-wick applicator	32
Fig 3.1 Botanical composition of untreated patches over time	62
Fig 3.2 Pasture production as a percentage of untreated control for the first 3 months after application (mean of 6 patches). Vertical bars represent standard errors of the mean values.	63
Fig 3.3 Clover content of patches over time (mean of 6 patches). Vertical bars represent standard errors of the mean values.	66
Fig 3.4 Botanical composition over time (mean of six replicates) of small and large patches treated on 6 Dec 2004 with low or high rates of metsulfuron.....	67

- Fig 3.5** Botanical composition over time (mean of six replicates) of small and big patches treated on 7 Dec 2004 with low or high rates of glyphosate.68
- Fig 3.6** Botanical composition over time (mean of six replicates) of small and big patches treated on 6 Dec 2004 with low or high rates of triclopyr/picloram.....70
- Fig 3.7** Botanical composition over time (mean of six replicates) of small and big patches treated on 6 Dec 2004 with low or high rates of clopyralid. .71
- Fig 3.8** The effect of two rates of metsulfuron on clover seedlings grown in the treated soil at different times after application (Vertical bars refer to standard errors of the mean of nine samples with three samples from each patch).....72
- Fig 3.9** The effect of two rates of clopyralid on clover seedlings grown in the treated soil at different times after application (Vertical bars refer to standard errors of the mean of nine samples with three samples from each patch).....72
- Fig 3.10** The effect of two rates of triclopyr/picloram on clover seedlings grown in the treated soil at different times after application (Vertical bars refer to standard errors of the mean of nine samples with three samples from each patch).....73
- Fig 4.1** The effect (29 weeks after treatment) of applying metsulfuron to either the centre of the rosette or the whole ragwort rosette. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10).....89
- Fig 4.2** The effect (29 weeks after treatment) of applying triclopyr/picloram to either the centre of the rosette or the whole ragwort rosette. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10).....90

- Fig 4.3** The effect (20 weeks after treatment) of applying metsulfuron to either the centre of the rosette or the whole Scotch thistle rosette. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10).....91
- Fig 4.4** The effect (20 weeks after treatment) of applying triclopyr/picloram to either the centre of the rosette or to the whole Scotch thistle rosette. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=10).....91
- Fig 5.1** Total monthly rainfall (mm) and average maximum temperatures (°C) for the duration of the trial as measured at the local AgResearch weather station 1km from the trial site..... 101
- Fig 5.2** The clover composition of plots after herbicide application by a Rotowiper in February 2005. (Vertical bars refer to SEM, n=4). 109
- Fig 5.3** Average number of prostrate weeds per m² for a double pass 3 months after wiper application of herbicides by a rotary weed wiper. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, P< 0.05). 110
- Fig 5.4** The number of Californian thistles stems/m² after Rotowiper application of herbicides at different stages. Bars with the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, P< 0.05)..... 111
- Fig 5.5** Average clover content of plots as measured by point analysis 6 weeks after application of herbicides by a Rotowiper. Bars with the same letter are not significantly different (P< 0.05). 112
- Fig 5.6** Average clover content of plots by visual scores 6 weeks after application of herbicides by a Rotowiper, where 1 = no clover present and

- 10 = abundant clover. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 113
- Fig 5.7** Average number of thistle stems/m² after metsulfuron treatment with a Rotowiper in different directions. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 114
- Fig 5.8** The effect on clover content of plots 6 months after single and double passes of a wiper applying metsulfuron to Californian thistle. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$).
..... 115
- Fig 6.1** The arrangement of Petri dishes around clumps of rushes. The arrow indicates the direction of travel of the wiper..... 134
- Fig 6.2** Herbicide effects on tiller necrosis six weeks after treatment with glyphosate and metsulfuron. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 137
- Fig 6.3** The dry weight (g/pot) of clover growing under treated Californian thistle plants 13 weeks after metsulfuron and triclopyr/ treatment. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$).
..... 138
- Fig 6.4** The dry weight (g) of Californian thistle plants 13 weeks after metsulfuron and triclopyr/picloram treatment. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 139
- Fig 6.5** The relationship between type of applicator, speed and presence or absence of weeds on the amount of herbicide collected in Petri dishes. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$). 140

- Fig 6.6** The amount of force (N) required to push the sliding gate over clumps of rushes and artificial weeds..... 142
- Fig 6.7** The severity of clover injury 20 days after simulated rainfall washed herbicide off Californian thistle plants on to the clover. Means with the same letter are not significantly different. 143
- Fig 6.8** The proportion of white clover pots showing herbicide injury symptoms 20 days after simulated rainfall washed herbicide off Californian thistle plants on to the clover. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=24)..... 144
- Fig 6.9** The dry weight of clover as a percentage of untreated control 9 weeks after simulated rainfall to wash herbicides off treated thistles. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$). 145
- Fig 6.10** The severity of grass injury 20 days after simulated rainfall washed herbicide off Californian thistle plants on to the ryegrass. Means with the same letter are not significantly different. 146
- Fig 6.11** The proportion of ryegrass pots showing herbicide injury symptoms 20 days after simulated rainfall washed herbicide off Californian thistle plants on to the ryegrass. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=24). 147
- Fig 7.1** A standard curve showing the relationship between the concentration of clopyralid and its absorbance at 280 nm using a UV–VIS spectrophotometer..... 163
- Fig 7.2** The proportion of clopyralid recovered from non-absorbent PVC strips after 10 and 30 minutes. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=9). 168
- Fig 7.3** The proportion of applied clopyralid recovered from rushes after 10 and 30 minutes. (Vertical bars represent SEM, n=9). 168

- Fig 7.4** The quantity of clopyralid deposited on artificial weeds by the Eliminator at different moisture levels (low, medium and high) and two speeds (5 & 10 km/hr). Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 169
- Fig 7.5** The quantity of clopyralid deposited on artificial weeds by the Eliminator at different speed levels. The Co-efficient of variation (CV) = 17%. 171
- Fig 7.6** The quantity of clopyralid deposited on artificial weeds by the Rotowiper at different speed levels. CV = 30%..... 171
- Fig 7.7** The quantity of clopyralid deposited on artificial weeds by the Weedswiper at different speed levels. CV = 13%. 172
- Fig 7.8** The quantity of clopyralid deposited on artificial weeds by wiper applicators at 5 km/hr. Means followed by the same letter are not significantly different (LSD, $P < 0.05$)..... 173
- Fig 7.9** The amount of clopyralid deposited at different weed positions by the Eliminator at 5 km/hr..... 174
- Fig 7.10** The amount of clopyralid deposited at different weed positions by the Rotowiper at 5 km/hr..... 174
- Fig 7.11** The amount of clopyralid deposited at different weed positions by the Weedswiper at 5 km/hr. 175

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 2.1 The Weedswiper used in the experiment	39
Plate 2.2 Three Eliminator wipers joined together	41
Plate 2.3 The Rotowiper similar to the one used in the trials.....	42
Plate 5.1 The rotary weed wiper (Rotowiper) used in the field trials.....	102
Plate 6.1 Arrangement of Petri dishes around the artificial weeds. The same number represents the dish and its lid.	132
Plate 7.1 Artificial weed structure showing weed positions (1-5) covered in plastic sleeves	165