

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.

Weed Control Practices
in New Zealand Pipfruit Orchards

Simon Blair Berry
1992

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment
of the requirement for the degree of
Master of Horticultural Science
at Massey University,
Palmerston North,
New Zealand

ABSTRACT

A survey of 77 growers, mainly in Hawkes Bay and Nelson, was undertaken during the summer of 1989/90. Personal interviews were conducted on each property. All growers were found to use herbicides for weed control, and all but one established herbicide strips with mown grass between. The major herbicide application period was spring. Three-quarters of growers relied on four herbicide formulations, amitrole, glyphosate, simazine and terbuthylazine/terbumeton. Of the residual herbicides used, 70% were triazines. Grower knowledge about herbicides was found to be lacking.

Grass species from the sub-family Paniceae were found to be the most problematic weeds, along with mallows, black nightshade, Californian thistle, tall willow herb and docks. These weeds were not adequately controlled by current weed control practices. Off-label use and herbicide damage to crop trees was noted.

Growers were found to be applying herbicides through a wide array of equipment, through fan and off-centre nozzles with one to four nozzles on each boom.

Only 37% of sprayers were calibrated at least annually. During the survey 41 sprayers were calibrated, with only 17% being correct within $\pm 5\%$ of intended application rate. Of those sprayers with errors over $\pm 5\%$ two-thirds were underapplying at mean error of 37%, and one-third were overapplying at a mean error of 18.1%. Spray distribution patterns were found to be unacceptably uneven across the herbicide strip in most cases.

Over 40% of growers were not able to relate the actual amount of herbicide used to a target application rate per hectare.

A lack of training in both chemical use for weed control and sprayer calibration was apparent, and 80% of growers saw a need for a field manual.

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS

New Zealand; pipfruit; weed control practices; herbicide use; sprayer calibration; accuracy of application; portable spray patternator.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For financial support:

- New Zealand Apple and Pear Marketing Board;
- Turners and Growers Research Fund;
- New Zealand Fruitgrowers Federation;
- Massey University Research Foundation.

To people who helped:

- Ralph Sims, my supervisor, for organising financial support, drawing figures, and with Kerry Harrington, co-supervisor, for prompt attention to drafts, useful comments, and help in sourcing literature;
- All the pipfruit growers who cooperated during the survey;
- Mary Hinds for tireless work in typing the thesis and attention to detail;
- Cecelia Berry, my wife, who checked final drafts and organised all the photos;
- My father, Peter Berry, for his help in preparing the questionnaire, and as a kiwifruit grower being interviewed from drafts to test the logic flow;
- John-Paul Praat for helping with bar graphs;
- David Grant, whose Ph.D thesis was not completed due to work commitments, allowing me the latitude in my job to complete this thesis - I am deeply indebted;
- Andy Lawson for his help in building the portable spray patternator, and assisting with setting up the display at Mystery Creek;
- Staff at Fruit Crops Unit, Massey University, who coped whilst I wrote up the work, having only limited time to manage the orchard.
- Bruce MacKay and Keith Funnell for access to their laser printer.
- To Crom, my Chesapeake Bay Retriever, CH.Brasha Joe of Chesahill, who had to forfeit a year's hunting, waiting patiently at my feet whilst I completed the thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of tables	vii
List of plates	xii
List of figures and charts	xv
List of plants	xvi
List of chemicals	xviii
Executive summary	xx
1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	3
2.1 Reasons for using herbicides in orchards	3
2.2 Pesticide issues	4
2.3 Accuracy of field sprayers	6
2.4 Concluding statement	9
3. METHODOLOGY	11
3.1 Survey format	11
3.2 Selection of orchardists	12
3.3 Interview technique	13
3.4 Equipment used for calibration	13
3.4.1 Portable spray patternator	14
3.5 Statistical analysis	18
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	20
4.1 Description of crops grown	20
4.2 Weed control objectives	21
4.3 Weed control methods	25
4.3.1 Herbicide programmes	26
4.3.1.1 Autumn application period	27
4.3.1.2 Dormancy to budmovement application period	28
4.3.1.3 Greentip to fruitset application period	34
4.3.1.4 Summer application period	37
4.3.1.5 Special purpose applications	39
4.3.1.6 Further aspects of the seasons herbicide applications	41
4.3.2 Changes to season's herbicide programme	48
4.4 Herbicides and weeds	51
4.4.1 Weed species on orchards	51
4.4.2 Weed build up and herbicide failure	57
4.4.3 Solutions to problem weeds	61
4.4.4 Use of herbicides in a manner not according to label recommendations	62
4.4.5 Herbicide damage to pipfruit trees	68
4.5 Herbicide spraying equipment	84
4.5.1 Tank manufacture, size and age	84
4.5.2 Nozzle tip type, manufacturer, and composition	87
4.5.2.1 Arrangement of nozzles on booms	88
4.5.3 Basic maintenance of sprayers	96
4.5.4 Accuracy of operation during herbicide spraying	99
4.6 History of sprayer calibration	107
4.6.1 Historical calibrations	107
4.7 Accuracy of herbicide application	114
4.7.1 Components of sprayer utilization	114
4.8 Herbicide sprayer calibration	124
4.8.1 Error in individual sprayer settings	131
4.8.1.1 Forward speed	131

4.8.1.2	Nozzle output	132
4.8.1.3	Spray width	134
4.8.1.4	Effects of sprayer setting errors	136
4.8.2	Results from portable spray patternator	140
4.8.3	Correction of these problems: boom design	144
4.8.4	Orchard operation	145
4.9	Water rates for applying herbicides	146
4.9.1	Utilisation of recommended water rates	146
4.9.2	Calculation of herbicides to go into spray tank	152
4.10	Grower needs	157
4.10.1	Grower training and information	157
5.	CONCLUSIONS	160
5.1	Herbicides and weeds	160
5.2	Equipment utilisation	162
	APPENDICES	
Appendix 1:	Copy of survey questionnaire	163
Appendix 2:	List of growers surveyed	194
Appendix 3:	Glossary of herbicides	200
Appendix 4:	Summary of herbicide programmes	203
Appendix 5:	Sprayer setting errors	208
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	218

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Size of orchards visited and crops grown	20
Table 2	Overall objectives for weed control	21
Table 3	Methods of weed control including herbicide application as used by growers surveyed	25
Table 4	Herbicides used during autumn in the 76 orchards surveyed	28
Table 5	Herbicide combinations used in period of dormancy to bud movement (August and September)	29
Table 6	Frequency of herbicide use whether applied individually or in a mix in the period of dormancy to bud movement on 60 of the pipfruit orchards surveyed	31
Table 7.	Herbicides used in the period of greentip to fruitset (October-November)	34
Table 8.	Frequency of herbicide use whether applied individually or in a mix in the period of greentip to fruitset	36
Table 9	Herbicides applied in the period of summer (December to March), not including special purpose applications	38
Table 10	Frequency of herbicide use over summer whether applied in a mix or individually, not including special purpose applications	39
Table 11	Use of special purpose herbicides in 76 pipfruit orchards surveyed	40
Table 12	Frequency of herbicide use whether applied individually or in a mix in the period of dormancy to fruitset	42
Table 13	Number of knockdown herbicides used in the period autumn 1989 to summer 1990 by 76 pipfruit growers	43
Table 14	Application patterns of knockdown herbicides for 76 pipfruit growers over the season	44
Table 15	Number of residual herbicides used in the period autumn 1989 to summer 1990 by 76 pipfruit growers	45

Table 16	Pattern of use of residual herbicides analysed by chemical group used by 67 pipfruit growers	46
Table 17	Frequency of herbicides used in a chemical group	47
Table 18	Number of herbicide applications in four application periods and in total	48
Table 19	Herbicide programme changes anticipated for the next season of 75 pipfruit growers	49
Table 20	Number of weeds indicated as "worst weeds" when asked for three	51
Table 21	Single worst weed identified by 33 Nelson and 38 Hawkes Bay pipfruit growers	53
Table 22	Worst weed listed by pipfruit growers	55
Table 23	Weed species listed in Table 22 not controlled by the herbicide used	59
Table 24	Cost of residual herbicides in 1989	60
Table 25	Number of growers from the 77 respondents that admitted to using herbicides not registered for use in pipfruit	63
Table 26	Summary of herbicides used in a manner not according to label recommendations from a survey of 77 pipfruit orchards, collated from all questions	65
Table 27	Herbicides claimed to be responsible for damage on 76 pipfruit orchards. Multiple answers were acceptable	68
Table 28	Distribution of age of equipment (mainly tanks) by growers	85
Table 29	Distribution of tank sizes of 68 sprayers	87
Table 30	Analysis of nozzles used and type on orchard herbicide booms	88
Table 31	Arrangement of nozzles on booms	89
Table 32	Summary of arrangements of nozzles on booms	90
Table 33	Mechanism of spray control (on/off) and ease of reach	95
Table 34	Frequency of nozzle and pump filter cleaning	97

Table 35	Responses from 58 growers to reasons for occurrence of risk in occasionally spraying some lower tear leaves	100
Table 36	Conditions or situations in which growers see spray droplet drift	101
Table 37	Growers' actions after they thought lower branches of pipfruit crop may have come in contact with with herbicide spray	104
Table 38	Frequency of sprayer calibration from 63 pipfruit growers	108
Table 39	Last time herbicide sprayer was calibrated for 58 pipfruit growers	110
Table 40	Person carrying out calibration of sprayer (when done)	111
Table 41	Sprayer settings measured during calibration process	112
Table 42	The water rates claimed to be used by 76 pipfruit growers for applying herbicides	115
Table 43	Claimed total nozzle output of herbicide sprayers	116
Table 44	Intended forward speed of herbicide sprayers	117
Table 45	Engine speed set for herbicide spraying	118
Table 46	Claimed spray swath for one pass excluding overlap for 76 pipfruit growers	120
Table 47	Overlap in spray swath for 74 pipfruit growers	121
Table 48	Claimed operating pressure of 76 pipfruit growers	122
Table 49	Summary of range of claimed or intended application figures from Tables 38 to 44	123
Table 50	Actual application rate of 41 pipfruit herbicide sprayers	125
Table 51	Differences between intended application rate and measured application rate for 35 herbicide sprayers	127
Table 52	Actual forward speeds of 40 pipfruit sprayers during operation	131
Table 53	Forward speed errors of 30 herbicide sprayer tractors comparing intended rate to that measured	132

Table 54	Actual nozzle output from 39 sprayers	133
Table 55	Nozzle output errors of 14 pipfruit growers from 18 booms	134
Table 56	Actual spray widths of 39 pipfruit growers	135
Table 57	Spray width errors of 38 pipfruit growers	136
Table 58	Known errors of all sprayer settings for 14 pipfruit growers	137
Table 59	Comparison of application rates (L/ha) intended, recorded, and calibrated from 14 pipfruit growers	139
Table 60	Alternative application rates used by growers to apply herbicides in (litres water/ha)	148
Table 61	Number of water rates used by Nelson and Hawkes Bay growers	149
Table 62	Error in calculations of herbicides during mixing process	154
Table 3A.1	Nomenclature of broad-spectrum knockdown herbicides and their chemical group	201
Table 3A.2	Nomenclature of residual herbicides and their chemical group	201
Table 3A.3	Nomenclature of special purpose herbicides and their chemical group	202
Table 4A.1	Summary of herbicide programmes of 33 Nelson growers	203
Table 4A.2	Summary of herbicide programmes of 40 Hawkes Bay growers	205
Table 4A.3	Summary of herbicide programmes of all growers	206
Table 5A.1	Intended and actual application rates and errors of 41 herbicide sprayers	208
Table 5A.2	Intended and actual forward speed and errors of 41 herbicide sprayers	210
Table 5A.3	Actual and intended nozzle output and errors of 41 herbicide sprayers	212
Table 5A.4	Actual and intended herbicide strip widths of 41 herbicide sprayers	214

Table 5A.5 Percentage errors of sprayer forward speed, spray width, nozzle output, and total application error of 41 herbicide sprayers

216

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1.	Portable spray patternator after it has been used to collect spray	15
Plate 2	Portable spray patternator in position for collection of spray distribution	17
Plate 3	Display of patternator use and results at World Agricultural Expo	17
Plate 4	Stand of paspalum down an apple row in Nelson	22
Plate 5	Established herbicides strips showing no weeds down the row and closely mown grass	23
Plate 6	Sward of oxalis in a Nelson orchard. Good control of other species	23
Plate 7	Amitrole damage observed in young trees interplanted amongst older trees	33
Plate 8	Dead tree possibly resulting from ponding of simazine around its base following replanting in a row of older trees	33
Plate 9	Paspalum showing recovery following application of amitrole	57
Plate 10	A stump that was painted with glyphosate and diesel, following removal of every second tree down a row	70
Plate 11	Tree death from glyphosate poisoning, adjacent to painted stumps	70
Plate 12	View of glyphosate damage, including three dead trees on left and symptoms on adjacent trees. Note stumps removed between dead trees	71
Plate 13	Close up of less severe symptoms of glyphosate poisoning	71
Plate 14	Grower beside glyphosate damaged tree showing cracks in soil where he believed herbicide travelled down to be taken up by roots	72
Plate 15	Three young damaged trees in a row	73
Plate 16	Example of young trees expressing typical symptoms of "little leaf syndrome" due to uptake of glyphosate, through green tissue	74

Plate 17	Close up of severe symptoms of glyphosate damage	74
Plate 18	Amitrole damage where the herbicide has been applied under young apple trees	76
Plate 19	Amitrole damage on fruit bearing wood	76
Plate 20	Low hanging branch showing amitrole damage	77
Plate 21	Dead willows in the background were treated with 2,4-D/picloram. Apples in the bottom left are expressing hormone damage symptoms. It is suspected that intraspecific rootgrafting is involved	80
Plate 22	View of apple showing characteristic distortion of leaves, indicating contact with hormone herbicide in this case having come up from the roots	81
Plate 23	Tank placed up on pallet. Note use of string by right hand to lift boom up and down. Boom mounted on front	86
Plate 24	Spray tank mounted on a trailer	86
Plate 25	Single nozzle boom (brand new) and a Croplands herbicide spray tank	91
Plate 26	Homemade boom with two nozzles. Note very wide spray width (1.9m)	91
Plate 27	Close up of pipe plumbing of boom shown in Plate 26	92
Plate 28	Multi nozzle boom, depicting double head at end of boom	92
Plate 29	Shield to protect nozzles from pruned wood, branches and other obstacles	94
Plate 30	Shield to reduce wind drift	94
Plate 31	Low branches and poor weed control in January which may lead to another herbicide being applied	105
Plate 32	Growers' foot resting on string to control height of boom, to spray large weeds and smooth out changes in ground contour	130
Plate 33	This pattern, achieved by a single fan nozzle in this instance, produced an even distribution across the spray width, when overlapped (on the right)	140

Plate 34	An uneven distribution pattern due to poor nozzle spacing and poor selection of nozzles with different outputs	141
Plate 35	A spray distribution pattern for two nozzles that were badly worn and spaced too far apart	141
Plate 36	Boom with four nozzles. The third nozzle from the left has a higher output than the other three, as it was different	142
Plate 37-39	Pattern from booms with two nozzles side by side in a double head	143
Plate 40	Effects of nozzle drip on an otherwise near even pattern	144
Plate 41	Obstrusive mounting system. Note branch scratches on mudguards, and extra strengthening put on fittings	144

LIST OF FIGURES AND CHARTS

Figure 1	External and internal diameter of the pipe (not to scale)	15
Figure 2	Spraying practice to produce desired herbicide strip width. From Berry (1987)	119
Figure 3	Measured application rates vs. intended application rates of 35 pipfruit herbicide sprayers	126
Figure 4	Application errors of 35 orchard herbicide sprayers	128
Chart A1.1	Graphical derivation of forward speed for orchard herbicide sprayers used during survey. (Now needing modification based on study results.)	191
Chart A1.2	Graphical derivation of application rates using calculations from work sheet in survey. (Now needing modification based on study results.)	192
Chart A1.3	Times for patternator test based on measured forward speed	193

LIST OF PLANTS

Common names for plants have been sourced from Healy, (1984).

apple	<u>Malus domestica</u> Borkh.
amaranthus	<u>Amaranthus</u> spp.
asparagus	<u>Asparagus officinale</u> L.
barnyard grass	<u>Echinochloa crus-galli</u> (L.) Beauv.
black nightshade	<u>Solanum nigrum</u> L.
bracken fern	<u>Pteridium esculentum</u> (Forst.f.) Ckn.
brambles	<u>Rubus</u> spp.
bristle grass	<u>Setaria</u> spp.
broad leaved plantain	<u>Plantago major</u> L.
Californian thistle	<u>Cirsium arvense</u> (L.) Scop.
catsear	<u>Hyphochaeris radicata</u> L.
cocksfoot	<u>Dactylis glomerata</u> L.
cornbind	<u>Polygonum convolvulus</u> L.
couch	<u>Agropyron repens</u> (L.) Beauv.
creeping buttercup	<u>Ranuncululus repens</u> L.
creeping mallow	<u>Modiola caroliniana</u> (L.) G. Don.
creeping yellow cress	<u>Rorippa sylvestris</u> (L.) Besser.
docks	<u>Rumex</u> spp.
dwarf mallow	<u>Malva neglecta</u> Wallr.
fathen	<u>Chenopodium album</u> agg.
fennel	<u>Foeniculum vulgare</u> Mill.
field bindweed	<u>Convolvulus arvensis</u> L.
fleabane	<u>Conyza</u> spp.
French mallow	<u>Malva nicaeensis</u> All.
gorse	<u>Ulex europaeus</u> L.
greater bindweed	<u>Calystegia silvatica</u> (Kit.) Griseb.
groundsel	<u>Senecio vulgaris</u> L.
hawksbeard	<u>Crepis capillaris</u> (L.) Wallr.
hedge mustard	<u>Sisymbrium officinale</u> (L.) Scop.
Indian doab	<u>Cynodon dactylon</u> (L.) Pers.
Jersey cudweed	<u>Gnaphalium luteo-album</u> L.

large flowered mallow	<u>Malva sylvestris</u> L.
mercier grass	<u>Paspalum distichum</u> L.
narrow leaved plantain	<u>Plantago lanceolata</u> L.
nashi	<u>Pryus pyrifolia</u> (Burm.f.) Nakai var. <u>culta</u> (Makino) Nakai.
nectarine	<u>Prunus persica</u> (L.) Batsch var. <u>nectarina</u> (Ait) Maxim.
oxalis	<u>Oxalis</u> spp.
oxtongue	<u>Picris echioides</u> L.
paspalum	<u>Paspalum dilatatum</u> Poir.
penny royal	<u>Mentha pulegium</u> L.
phalaris	<u>Phalaris aquatica</u> L.
praire grass	<u>Bromus willdenowii</u> Kunth.
ryegrass	<u>Lolium</u> spp.
scrambling speedwell	<u>Veronica persica</u> Poir.
sheeps sorrel	<u>Rumex acetosella</u> L.
small flowered mallow	<u>Malva parviflora</u> L.
summergrass	<u>Digitaria sanguinalis</u> (L.) Scop.
sweet gum	<u>Liquidamber styraciflua</u> L.
tall willow herb	<u>Epilobium cillatum</u> Rat.
thorn apple	<u>Datura stramonium</u> L.
white clover	<u>Trifolium repens</u> L.
wild carrot	<u>Daucus carota</u> L.
wireweed	<u>Polygonum aviculare</u> agg.
yarrow	<u>Achillea millefolium</u> L.
yorkshire fog	<u>Holcus lanatus</u> L.

LIST OF CHEMICALS

Chemical names (IUPAC) have been sourced from Worthing and Walker (1987).

amitrole	1H-1,2,4-triazol-3ylamine
asulam	methylsulphanilylcarbamate
clopyralid	3,6-dichloropyridine-2-carboxylic acid
diazanone	O,O-diethyl O-2-isopropyl-6-methyl pyrimidin-4-yl phosphorothioate
dicamba	3,6-dichloro-o-anisic acid
diquat	9,10-dihydro-8a, 10a-diazoniaphenanthrene
diuron	3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1,1-dimethylurea
fluazifop-P-butyl	(R)-2-[4-(5-trifluoromethyl-2-pyridyloxy)phenoxy] propionic acid.
glufosinate	4-[hydroxy(methyl)phosphinoyl]-DL-homoalanine
glyphosate	N-(phosphonomethyl) glycine
haloxyfop	(RS)-2-[4-(3-chloro-5-trifluoromethyl-2-pyridyloxy-phenoxy)] propionic acid
linuron	3-(3,4-dichlorophenyl)-1-methoxy-1-methylurea
methabenzthiazuron	1-benzothiazol-2-yl-1,3-dimethylurea
metolachlor	2-chloro-6'-ethyl-N-(2-methoxy-1-methyl-1-methylethyl)acet-o-toluidide
metsulfuron	2-[3-(4-methylxy-6-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2yl)ureidosulphonyl] benzoic acid
norflurazon	4-chloro-5-methylamino-2(α,α,α -trifluoro-m-tolyl) pyridazin-3(2H)-one
oryzalin	3,5-dinitro-N ⁴ ,N ⁴ -dipropylsulphahilamide
oxadiazon	5- <i>tert</i> -butyl-3-(2,4-dichloro-5-isopropoxyphenyl)-1,3,4-oxadiazol-2(3H)-one
oxyfluorfen	2-chloro- α,α,α -trifluoro-p-tolyl-3-ethoxy-4-nitrophenyl ether
paraquat	1,1-dimethyl-4,4-bipyridium
pendimethalin	N-(1-ethyl propyl)-2,6-dinitro-3,4 xylidine

picloram	4-amino-3,5,6-trichloropyridine-2-carboxylic acid
simazine	6-chloro-N ² ,N ⁴ -diethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine
terbacil	3- <i>tert</i> -butyl-5-chloro-6-methyluracil
terbumeton	N ² - <i>tert</i> -butyl-N ⁴ -ethyl-6-methoxy-1,3,5 triazine-2,4-diamine
terbuthylazine	N ² - <i>tert</i> -butyl-6-chloro-N ⁴ -ethyl-1,3,5-triazine-2,4-diamine
2,4-D	(2,4-dichlorophenoxy) acetic acid
2,4,5-T	(2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy) acetic acid

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In the summer of 1989/90 77 pipfruit growers were surveyed to ascertain their weed control practices and accuracy of herbicide application.

In regions visited all 77 growers used herbicides to control weeds. All but one of these growers had established herbicide strips beneath the trees with grass growing between the rows. All growers used mowers, and some also grazed their orchards in autumn. Over 80% of the growers aimed to keep their herbicide strips free from all weeds.

The common application period for herbicides was spring, with most growers using a combination of knockdown and residual herbicides. Over 90% of orchardists used herbicides during the summer.

Glyphosate was the most popular herbicide being used on two-thirds of the orchards surveyed. Seventy-five percent of growers relied on four herbicide formulations, glyphosate, simazine, amitrole and terbuthylazine/terbumeton. Knockdown herbicides, used by all growers, ranged from one to five applications per annum, with 70% of growers applying two or three. Residual herbicides were used by 87% growers, with applications ranging from one to three per annum, one being applied by two-thirds of the growers. Herbicides from the triazine group were used by 70% of growers.

Two-thirds of the growers were unhappy with their weed control programmes, as they failed to control their problem weeds. A lack of understanding and knowledge of herbicides was found to be common. At least a quarter of growers anticipated increasing their herbicide use next season (1990/91).

Paspalum, Indian doab, couch, mallows, black nightshade, summergrass, Californian thistle, tall willow herb, docks and barnyard grass were found to be the ten most problematic weeds, although convolvulus was a particular problem in Hawkes Bay. These weeds were not adequately controlled the current herbicides utilised at the rates applied. This led growers to use non-registered herbicides on some of these species. Current and past use of herbicides used in a manner not according to label

recommendations was recorded on 45% of orchards. However most of it was during innocuous careful spot spraying, and unlikely to lead to residue problems.

Herbicide damage to crop trees past and present, was recorded on 71% of orchards in 79 cases. Two-thirds of this was caused by glyphosate and most damage was isolated to single branches or young trees. Translocation through root grafting from poisoned crop and shelter trees was recorded. Most herbicide damage occurred because growers took no action if low foliage was accidentally sprayed or drift was seen to occur. Use of unregistered herbicides was not causing problems.

Commercially made herbicide spray equipment was used by 55% of orchardists, although most had been modified, particularly the spray booms. Growers used only fan or off-centre nozzles manufactured predominantly from brass. One to four nozzles were installed on booms with 60% using two nozzles. Nozzle assemblies and filters were rarely cleaned and less often replaced.

With regards to sprayer calibration 17% of sprayers had never been calibrated, 37% calibrated at least annually, and 46% calibrated infrequently.

Of the 41 sprayers calibrated during the survey 12% were within $\pm 5\%$ of the intended application rate, 17% were within ± 5 to 10%, 14% within ± 10 to 20%, and 57% were over $\pm 20\%$ and therefore unacceptable. Two-thirds of sprayers with errors over $\pm 5\%$ were underapplying at a mean rate of 37% and one-third were overapplying at a mean error of 18%. Spray distribution patterns as monitored using a spray patternator were unacceptable in most cases.

Over 40% of growers were not able to relate the amount of herbicide used to a target rate per hectare, and were not able to accurately document use.

Only 25% of growers had formal training in chemical weed control and sprayer calibration. Eighty percent of growers saw a need for a field manual on herbicide spraying and calibration.

Overall the survey highlighted major concerns regarding the use and application of herbicides by pipfruit orchardists.

Further work should focus on developing a boom with a nozzle arrangement that will provide an even coverage across the spray width. In addition education about herbicide application and weed control is necessary and a field manual should be produced.