

Keeping Up With Research

JANUARY 1975

Two Ways to Fight Alfalfa Weevils

E. L. Eshbaugh, E. L. Sorensen, and W. A. Moore²

Alfalfa weevil (Hypera postica Gyllenhal) is the major pest attacking alfalfa (Medicago sativa L.) in Kansas now. Although introduced into the United States near Salt Lake City, Utah, before 1904, it was 1960 before the weevils were first discovered in Cheyenne and Hamilton counties, Kansas. They had spread to 40 western Kansas counties by 1969, and an eastern strain, discovered in Maryland in 1951, infested alfalfa fields in Cherokee County, southeastern Kansas, in 1967.

The eastern strain spread west and north and caused serious damage to some Kansas fields by 1972. The eastern strain and possibly hybrids of the eastern and western strains spread to all of Kansas in 1974, when at least 95 percent of the acreage was infested. More than 824,000 acres were treated with insecticides in 1974, 220,000 in 1973, and 49,200 in 1972.

A pest of the first cutting, the weevil may also damage the second cutting by eating new growth in its early stages. Larval stages of the weevil do most of the damage.

The weevil passes through egg, larval, pupal, and adult stages. It produces one generation

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION Kansas State University, Manhattan Floyd W. Smith, Director

during the growing season and a partial second generation when falls remain warm. We conducted trials at the South-Central Kan-

sas Experiment Field near Hutchinson, Kansas to determine the effects of insecticides and alfalfa management on the alfalfa weevil.

Materials and Methods

Insecticides

We tested eight insecticides on Buffalo alfalfa in a randomized complete block design with three replications. Plots were 5 ft. x 30 ft. Inscticides were applied April 17, 1974. Weevil larvae were sampled four times with a 15-inch sweep net (April 17 and 24 and May 15 and 29).

Plots were harvested and yields calculated in tons per acre dry weight and percent of control.

Alfalfa Management

To test alfalfa management without insecticides, we established eight plots (12 ft. x 100 ft.) in Buffalo alfalfa in February 1974. The fall growth was removed from four plots, and left standing in the other four.

Weevil larvae were sampled five times (April

17 and 24, May 15 and 29, and July 3).

Results and Discussion

Insecticides

Before we applied insecticides, weevil larvae were uniformly distributed over the test plots (Table 1, April 17 sampling date).

All insecticides at indicated rates (Table 1) significantly reduced larvae within 1 .week (April 24). No larvae were found in plots treated with either 0.25 or 0.50 lb ai/A of Furadan. Two weeks later, larvae still averaged less than 0.5 larvae per sweep on the Furadan-treated plots, compared with 12.4 on the control (untreated) plots. Where Furadan was applied at 0.5 lb ai/A, larvae averaged less than one per sweep at harvest 5 weeks after treatment. Vydate, Imidan, Alfa-Cide, and Supracide also controlled well over 5 weeks (Table 1). First-cut forage yields were directly related to numbers of larvae, varying from 1.23 tons/acre from the control plot to 1.63 for the Furadan plots (Table

We observed no phytotoxicity from any insecticide tested.

Table 1. Effects of insecticides on alfalfa weevils and forage yields.

| | | | Larvae/ | Forage | Forage yield | | |
|---------------------|---------|-----------------|----------|--------|--------------|------|-----------------|
| Treatment | lb ai/A | April 17 | April 24 | May 15 | May 29 | T/A | As % of control |
| Alfa-Cide | 3.00 | 2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 1.61 | 131 |
| Alfa-tox | 2.25 | 2.1 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 4.6 | 1.50 | 122 |
| Furadan 4F | 0.25 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 1.60 | 130 |
| Furadan 4F | 0.50 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.63 | 132 |
| Imidan 50W | 1.00 | 2.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 3.1 | 1.48 | 120 |
| Lannate 90W | 0.25 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 2.3 | 5.6 | 1.43 | 116 |
| Lannate 90W | 0.50 | 1.9 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 5.8 | 1.46 | 119 |
| Lannate 90W | 1.00 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 1.8 | 4.7 | 1.48 | 120 |
| Lannate L 1.8 | 0.25 | 2.6 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 6.7 | 1.38 | 112 |
| Lannate L 1.8 | 0.50 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 2.1 | ` 6.0 | 1.44 | 117 |
| Nudrin 1.8 | 0.22 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 1.9 | <i>7</i> .1 | 1.29 | 105 |
| Nudrin 1.8 | 0.45 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 6.4 | 1.32 | 107 |
| Nudrin 1.8 | 0.90 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 4.4 | 1.35 | 110 |
| Núdrin 2.4 | 0.22 | 1.8 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 4.4 | 1.49 | 121 |
| Nudrin 2.4 | 0.45 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 1.9 | 4.4 | 1.46 | 119 |
| Nudrin 2.4 | 0.90 | 2.4 | 0.4 | 1.7 | 3.6 | 1.50 | 122 |
| Supracide 2E | 0.50 | 2.3 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.46 | 119 |
| Vydate L | 0.25 | 2.1 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 3.1 | 1.45 | 118 |
| Vydate L | 0.50 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 3.9 | 1.59 | 129 |
| Control (untreated) | | 2.0 | 3.9 | 12.4 | 20.2 | 1.23 | 100 |
| LSD .051 | | NS ² | 0.9 | 1.1 | 2.9 | 0.23 | |

^{1.} Unless the difference between two entries is equal or great and the LSD value, little confidence can be placed in the superiority of one treatment over another.

Table 2. Alfalfa management to control alfalfa weevil, south-central Kansas experiment field, Hutchinson, Kansas, 1974.

| Treatment | | arvae/swe | Plant height (inches) | | Forage yield, Tons/A dry wt. | | | |
|--------------------|----------|-----------|--------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|-------|--------|--------|
| | April 17 | April 24 | May 15 | May 29 | July 3 | May 6 | June 7 | May 29 |
| Uncut ¹ | 7.1 | 13.8 | 36.2 | 19.1 | 2.8 | 13.7 | 9.2 | 0.99 |
| | *3 | * | * | * | | * | * | * |
| Cut ² | 1.3 | 4.3 | 20.0 | 11.9 | 2.9 | 17.8 | 11.1 | 1.49 |

^{1.} Fall growth not removed.

^{2.} Differences between treatments not statistically different.

^{2.} Fall growth cut and forage removed, Feb. 12, 1974.

^{3.} Figures separated by asterisks differ statistically (.05).

This publication from Kansas State University Agricultural Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension Service has been archived. Current information: http://www.ksre.ksu.edu.

Alfaifa Management

Larvae were reduced 82% by April 17 by removal of fall growth in February. April 17 larvae hatched from eggs laid the previous fall. One week (April 24) and 4 weeks (May 15) late larvae were reduced 69 and 45 percent, respectively. The May 15 data mainly reflect larvae hatched from eggs laid in the spring. At harvest time (May 29), only 38 percent fewer larvae were found on plots with fall growth undisturbed.

Apparently, removing fall growth removed most of the weevil eggs laid the previous fall. That process might reduce insecticide applications from two to one. During some years, an insecticide might not be needed until after the first harvest. Also (although no data were obtained), removing fall growth may expose adult weevils to winter temperature, other climatic factors, and predators, or the weevils may leave the field to seek shelter. We plan additional studies to determine effects on adult weevils of removing fall alfalfa growth. We know that removing the fall growth reduces other insect pests such as pea aphids.

At harvest time, average height of alfalfa on the plots where fall growth had been removed was 17.8, compared to 13.7 inches on the uncut plots. Corresponding heights for recovery after June 14 cutting were 11.1 and 9.2 inches (Table 2).

First-cut forage yields for the cut and uncut treatments were 1.50 and 0.99 tons per acre dry weight—or ½ ton for removal of fall growth. The fall growth of alfalfa after the last cutting should not be removed until after the first frost, and then only when temperatures are expected to remain low so the weevils lay no more eggs. Cutting then does not injure alfalfa, but it removes most of the weevil eggs.

Information here provides preliminary guidelines for farmers, producers, colleagues, industry cooperators, and others. It is not a recommendation or endorsement and does not contain all approved or effective insecticides. It is based on 1 year of research.

Publications and public meetings by the Kansas Agricultural Experiment Station are available and open to the public regardless of race, color, national origin, sex, or religion.

^{1.} Contribution No. 1130 and 1474, Department of Entomology and Department of Agronomy and South-Central Kansas Experiment Field, respectively, in cooperation with the Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture.

^{2.} Research Entomologist, Department of Entomology, Research Agronomist, Agricultural Research Service, U. S. Department of Agriculture, and Research Agronomist, Department of Agronomy.