

2001

RUTGERS

Turfgrass Proceedings



THE NEW JERSEY TURFGRASS ASSOCIATION

In Cooperation With

RUTGERS COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
NEW JERSEY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION
RUTGERS, THE STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW JERSEY
NEW BRUNSWICK

Distributed in cooperation with U.S. Department of Agriculture in furtherance of the Acts of Congress of May 8 and June 30, 1914. Cooperative Extension work in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H. Zane R. Helsel, Director of Extension. Rutgers Cooperative Extension provides information and educational services to all people without regard to sex, race, color, national origin, disability or handicap, or age. Rutgers Cooperative Extension is an Equal Opportunity Employer.

2001 RUTGERS TURFGRASS PROCEEDINGS

of the

**New Jersey Turfgrass Expo
December 11-13, 2001
Trump Taj Mahal
Atlantic City, New Jersey**

The Rutgers Turfgrass Proceedings is published yearly by the Rutgers Center for Turfgrass Science, Rutgers Cooperative Extension, and the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Cook College, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey in cooperation with the New Jersey Turfgrass Association. The purpose of this document is to provide a forum for the dissemination of information and the exchange of ideas and knowledge. The proceedings provide turfgrass managers, research scientists, extension specialists, and industry personnel with opportunities to communicate with co-workers. Through this forum, these professionals also reach a more general audience, which includes the public.

This publication includes lecture notes of papers presented at the 2001 New Jersey Turfgrass Expo. Publication of these lectures provides a readily available source of information covering a wide range of topics and includes technical and popular presentations of importance to the turfgrass industry.

This proceedings also includes research papers that contain original research findings and reviews of selected subjects in turfgrass science. These papers are presented primarily to facilitate the timely dissemination of original turfgrass research for use by the turfgrass industry.

Special thanks are given to those who have submitted papers for this proceedings, to the New Jersey Turfgrass Association for financial assistance, and to those individuals who have provided support to the Rutgers Turfgrass Research Program at Cook College, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Dr. Ann Brooks Gould, Editor
Dr. Bruce B. Clarke, Coordinator

PERFORMANCE OF FINE FESCUE CULTIVARS AND SELECTIONS IN NEW JERSEY TURF TRIALS

Yuanhong Han, Pedro Perdomo, James A. Murphy, William A. Meyer, Stacy A. Bonos, William K. Dickson, Dirk A. Smith, Ronald F. Bara, Melissa M. Mohr, and Eric Watkins¹

The fine fescues include several species that can persist under limited soil water availability and low nitrogen fertility. Fine fescues can form a dense, attractive turf cover; blue, hard and strong creeping red fescues, however, do not tolerate a low height of cut. The species used as turf include both bunch types [Chewings fescue (*Festuca rubra* L. subsp. *falax*), hard fescue (*F. brevipila*, formerly *F. longifolia*), sheeps fescue (*F. ovina*), *F. pseudovina*, and blue fescue (*F. glauca*)] and rhizomatous types [slender creeping red fescue (*F. rubra* L. subsp. *littoralis*, formerly *F. rubra* L. subsp. *trichophylla*) and strong creeping red fescue (*F. rubra* L. subsp. *rubra*)].

The fine fescues are characterized by fine, wiry leaves that have a tube-like appearance, especially when leaves roll during dry weather. Chewings fescues form a dense turf, whereas strong creeping and slender creeping red fescues produce a more open turf due to their rhizomatous growth habit. The strong creeping red fescues are more strongly rhizomatous and have a more open growth habit than the slender creeping red fescues. Newer hard fescue cultivars have improved turf-type characteristics and are similar in density and texture to the Chewings fescues. Hard fescues also have lower nutrient requirements, better disease resistance under low maintenance, and a slower growth rate. Sheeps fescues and blue fescues have stiff, bluish-green leaves and require little maintenance.

Strong creeping red fescues are often used as a companion grass in mixtures with Kentucky bluegrass because they have similar color, growth habit, and density. Compared to Kentucky bluegrass, the strong creeping red fescues have better establishment and seedling vigor and, after establishment, dominate in

heavily shaded areas. Hard fescues are used for soil erosion control in low maintenance areas, and sheeps fescues are used to stabilize sandy soil and banks along irrigation canals. The sheeps and blue fescues are used in wildflower mixes for soil stabilization and for their attractive bluish foliage.

Fine fescues can be maintained best under reduced nitrogen (N) fertilization. Ideally, fine fescue should be fertilized with no more than 1 to 2 lb N/1000 ft² per year; sheeps, blue, and hard fescues require less N nutrition than the other species. Most fine fescues can tolerate mowing heights of 1.5 to 2.0 inches but perform best above 2.5 inches.

Fine fescues that contain the *Neotyphodium* endophyte can exhibit enhanced tolerance to insects, diseases, and environmental stress. This endophyte is a fungus that grows in the crown and leaf sheath tissues of the turfgrass plant. The effects of this endophyte on plant growth are generally not apparent during periods of low environmental stress; however, under stressful conditions, the endophyte-plant relationship produces compounds that improve resistance to some biotic and abiotic stresses.

Breeding efforts continue to enhance turf characteristics of the fine fescues and improve resistance to diseases, insects, and environmental stresses. Incorporation of endophytes into improved plant material provides an efficient way to increase stress tolerance. The Rutgers breeding program, in cooperation with the National Turfgrass Evaluation Program (NTEP), is involved in an extensive program where the performance of many cultivars and experimental selections is evaluated.

¹Graduate Assistant, County Agricultural Agent, Associate Extension Specialist in Turfgrass Management, Research Professor, Assistant Professor, Turfgrass Research Farm Supervisor, Principle Laboratory Technician, Principle Laboratory Technician, Soil and Plants Technician, and Graduate Assistant, respectively, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Cook College, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8520.

PROCEDURES

Fine fescue trials were conducted at the Rutgers Plant Biology and Pathology Research and Extension Farm at Adelphia, NJ (Tables 1, 2, and 5 to 7), Horticultural Research Farm II at North Brunswick, NJ (Table 3), and the Rutgers Snyder Research and Extension Farm at Pittstown, NJ (Table 4). Tests at Adelphia and Pittstown were established in open areas with good air circulation. The trial at North Brunswick was in an area with reduced air circulation. All entries were seeded in 3 X 5 ft plots at a rate of 3.7 lb/1000 ft². Plots were replicated three times in a randomized complete block design.

Tests were fertilized at different nitrogen rates, mowed at different heights, and subjected to varying levels of drought stress depending on the objective of the test during the evaluation period (Table 8). After establishment, tests were infrequently irrigated to avoid severe drought stress and dormancy. Plots were mowed at a frequency to avoid excessive accumulation of clippings.

Broadleaf weeds were controlled at Adelphia with spring or fall applications of 2,4-D + Dicamba, and Bensulide was used as a preemergent control of annual grassy weeds. At North Brunswick, Confront was applied to control the broadleaf weeds (primarily white clover), Dimension was applied as a preemergent herbicide to control annual grassy weeds, and Merit was applied in July for grub control. The test at Pittstown received a spring application of Trimec Classic.

The seven tests were evaluated throughout the year by visually rating for turf quality. Turf quality is a subjective rating that is based on density, texture, uniformity, color, growth habit, and freedom from disease or insect damage. Other ratings included: seedling establishment, vigor, spring green-up, green cover, color, and resistance to red thread (*Laetisaria fuciformis*), dollar spot (*Sclerotinia homoeocarpa*), and leaf spot (*Bipolaris sorokiniana*). All ratings were taken using a 1 to 9 scale with 9 representing the best turf quality, best establishment, or least disease.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data presented in Tables 1 through 5 are grouped by species and ranked by their multiple year quality average. This was done to facilitate comparison of

cultivars and selections within a species. In Table 6, cultivars of all species are ranked together by the quality average. Table 7 is grouped by species and ranked by turf quality in 2001.

In general, the Chewings and hard fescues performed better than the other species with many selections forming a dense, attractive turf (Tables 1 to 7). Several of the new selections within the strong creeping red fescues performed well at all locations. Although improvement in turf quality of sheeps and slender creeping red fescues continues, these species still rank lower than the others in turf quality (Tables 1 to 7).

Establishment in the fine fescues varied among the cultivars within any given species (Table 7). Two selections of strong creeping red fescues established very well (Jasper II and Common creeper). The Chewings fescues and strong creeping red fescues exhibited early spring green-up, and both rated higher than the other species in the 1998 Adelphia and North Brunswick tests (Tables 2 and 3). They also had better green cover in the 1998 North Brunswick test (Table 3).

In the test seeded September 1999 at Adelphia (Table 5), hard fescues had very good resistance to dollar spot. ABT HF I '99 and Oxford had no disease, and all other cultivars rated 6.7 or higher. Strong creeping red fescues were generally more susceptible to this disease, although Pathfinder, FLE comp, and Fenway exhibited better resistance. Much of this resistance was due to a high percentage of viable endophyte in the seed lots used to establish these tests. In the test seeded September 2000 at Adelphia (Table 7), hard fescues showed good resistance to leaf spot disease while the other species were more susceptible. Generally, hard fescues had the best resistance to red thread (Tables 1 to 4).

Breeding efforts continue to improve turf-type characteristics in the fine fescues. The area of insect and disease resistance is also an important focus of the Rutgers program. We continue to look at the use of endophytes to supplement breeding efforts to improve the natural ability of a cultivar to persist under stress. The success of the efforts of the Rutgers breeding program is well documented in the superior quality exhibited by many of the newer experimental selections. Further improvements, however, are still needed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station Publication No. E-12264-2-02. This work was conducted as part of NJAES Project No. 12264, supported by the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, State, and

Hatch Act Funds, the Rutgers Center for Turfgrass Science, other grants, and gifts. Additional support was received from the United States Golf Association, the New Jersey Turfgrass Association, and the National Turfgrass Evaluation Program.

Table 1 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹					Red Thread ² June 2001
	1998- 2001 Avg.	1998 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
BLUE FESCUE (cont.)						
6 FO G-93-97	2.9	3.6	3.2	2.9	1.9	4.7
7 FO I-92-97	2.9	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.0	4.0
LSD at 5% =	0.5	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.8	2.0

¹9 = best turf quality²9 = least disease

Table 2 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹				Spring Green-up ² April 2001	Red Thread ³ May 2001
	1999-2001 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.		
STRONG CREEPING RED FESCUE (cont.)						
21 Rose	4.0	4.5	3.7	3.7	7.3	2.7
22 FR-47	4.0	4.2	3.8	3.9	6.0	4.3
23 SRO FF 11	3.9	3.8	4.1	3.9	6.3	3.7
24 FR-27	3.9	4.2	3.7	3.9	6.3	4.7
25 FR-46	3.9	4.0	3.8	4.0	5.0	4.7
26 Trapeze	3.9	4.2	3.4	4.0	7.0	5.3
27 FR-01-4-25	3.8	3.7	3.8	4.0	6.3	5.3
28 Salsa	3.8	4.4	3.2	3.6	7.3	4.0
29 ASC 172	3.7	3.4	3.6	4.0	3.3	5.0
30 Common Creeper	3.3	3.0	3.0	3.7	5.7	4.3
31 Boreal	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2	5.7	3.7
32 Claudia	2.1	1.2	1.9	1.9	5.0	6.3
SHEEPS FESCUE						
1 Quattro	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.4	6.3	7.3
BLUE FESCUE						
2 Bighorn	4.3	4.6	4.2	4.0	2.3	7.3
3 SR 3200	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	2.7	6.7
DESCHAMPSIA						
1 SR 6000	3.8	4.5	3.4	2.8	4.0	6.5
2 Nortran	2.3	3.1	1.4	1.7	3.5	6.3
3 SR DESO	2.0	2.1	1.8	1.6	3.7	5.7
4 Norcoast	1.5	1.1	.	1.9	3.3	5.7
LSD at 5% =	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.7	1.7	1.8

¹9 = best turf quality²9 = earliest spring green-up³9 = least red thread

Table 3 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹				Spring	Red	Green	
	1999- 2001 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	Green-up ² April 2001	Thread ³ May 2001	Cover ⁴ Sept. 2001	Color ⁵ Sept. 2001
DESCHAMPSIA								
1 SR 6000	2.8	4.4	2.3	1.8	5.0	9.0	1.0	3.5
2 Norcoast	2.4	1.5	2.4	3.2	5.0	5.0	3.7	4.7
3 SR Deso	2.3	2.2	1.9	2.6	4.7	.	3.5	5.3
4 Nortran	2.0	2.9	1.2	2.0	4.7	.	2.0	4.0
TEXAS BLUEGRASS HYBRID								
1 Reveille	3.1	4.6	2.2	2.7	2.0	5.5	3.7	3.7
LSD at 5% =	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.0	1.5	2.3	1.9	1.6

¹9 = best turf quality²9 = earliest spring green-up³9 = least red thread⁴9 = most green cover⁵9 = darkest green color

Table 4. Performance of fine fescue cultivars and selections in a turf trial seeded in September 1998 at Pittstown, NJ.

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹				Red Thread ² June 2001
	1999- 2001 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
CHEWINGS FESCUE					
1 Longfellow II	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.6	7.3
2 Pick FRC B-93	5.0	5.5	4.7	4.8	7.0
3 Shadow II	4.9	5.4	4.8	4.6	6.0
4 ABT-CHW-2	4.9	5.2	4.7	4.9	6.7
5 ABT-CHW-3	4.9	5.3	4.6	4.8	8.0
6 BAR CHF 8 FUS 2	4.9	5.1	4.7	4.8	5.7
7 Wrigley	4.8	5.4	4.4	4.7	6.7
8 Pick FRC A-93	4.8	5.3	4.4	4.7	8.0
9 Ambassador	4.8	5.1	4.4	4.8	7.7
10 Hood	4.8	5.0	4.5	4.8	6.7
11 FC 49	4.7	5.2	4.2	4.8	7.0
12 FC 39	4.7	5.2	4.3	4.6	6.0
13 Intrigue	4.7	5.2	4.2	4.6	7.7
14 Banner III	4.6	5.3	4.3	4.2	6.7
15 FC 51	4.6	5.1	4.1	4.6	6.3
16 Treasure	4.6	4.6	4.3	4.8	6.7
17 FC11	4.6	5.1	4.2	4.4	6.0
18 Victory RS	4.5	4.9	4.1	4.6	6.3
19 Culombra	4.5	5.0	4.1	4.5	5.0
20 Silhouette	4.5	5.3	3.9	4.4	7.0
21 MB-63	4.5	5.1	4.1	4.2	5.7
22 Pick FRC A-93	4.5	5.0	3.9	4.5	7.0
23 FC 50	4.5	5.0	4.1	4.3	5.7
24 ACF 083	4.4	4.9	4.2	4.2	4.7
25 ABT-CHW-1	4.4	5.1	3.8	4.5	7.7
26 Tiffany	4.4	4.8	4.0	4.3	5.3
27 Pick FRC 2-96	4.4	4.9	3.9	4.3	7.0
28 Brittany	4.3	4.8	3.9	4.3	5.3
29 Victory II	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.3	5.3
30 Victory	4.3	4.7	3.9	4.3	5.3

Table 4 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹				Red Thread ² June 2001
	1999- 2001 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
STRONG CREEPING RED FESCUE (cont.)					
11 SRX 52961	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	6.3
12 Jasper E-	4.6	4.8	4.3	4.6	3.0
13 PST-47TCR	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.3	3.0
14 FR 46	4.5	4.9	4.8	3.9	4.0
15 BAR CF 8 FUS1	4.5	4.9	4.2	4.4	2.7
16 ASC 082	4.5	4.9	4.3	4.3	3.7
17 Jasper	4.5	4.7	4.1	4.7	5.0
18 Rose	4.4	4.8	4.3	4.1	3.7
19 DGSC 94	4.4	4.7	4.1	4.3	3.0
20 FR27	4.2	4.7	3.9	4.1	3.7
21 Trapeze	4.2	4.6	4.2	3.9	3.0
22 FR-01-4-25	4.2	4.7	3.8	4.1	3.3
23 SR 5210	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.5	4.3
24 Shademaster II	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.0	3.3
25 ASC 172	4.1	4.7	3.5	4.0	3.3
26 Syn 42 RR	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	3.0
27 Salsa	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.8	2.7
28 Vista	4.0	4.6	3.8	3.6	4.0
29 Common Creeper	3.9	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.3
30 FR 47	3.9	4.2	3.5	4.1	4.3
31 Boreal	3.8	4.2	3.7	3.6	3.3
32 Shademark	3.6	4.0	3.3	3.4	2.3
33 Claudia	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.6	5.3
SHEEPS FESCUE					
1 Quattro	5.2	5.1	4.8	5.6	8.0
BLUE FESCUE					
2 Azay	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.8	5.7
3 SR 3200	4.4	4.7	4.2	4.4	6.7
4 Bighorn	4.4	4.6	4.2	4.5	7.0
5 FO 53	4.3	4.7	4.2	3.9	5.7
6 FO 52	4.0	4.6	3.8	3.8	5.0
7 Teal	4.0	4.6	3.6	3.6	5.7

Table 4 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹				Red Thread ²
	1999- 2001 Avg.	1999 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
LSD at 5% =	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.5

¹9 = best turf quality

²9 = least red thread

Table 5. Performance of fine fescue cultivars and selections in a turf trial seeded in September 1999 at Adelphia, NJ.

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹			Dollar Spot ² Aug. 2001
	2000- 2001 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
CHEWINGS FESCUE				
1 DLC	5.7	5.1	6.2	8.0
2 SRX 5HH9	5.5	5.7	5.3	7.0
3 4601 comp	5.4	5.1	5.6	7.7
4 FRC B-93	5.4	5.8	4.9	6.7
5 Intrigue	5.4	5.1	5.6	7.7
6 SR 5020	5.2	5.2	5.2	6.3
7 FRC A-93	5.1	5.2	5.0	6.3
8 SRX 5II9	5.1	5.0	5.2	5.7
9 Victory II	5.1	5.5	4.6	6.0
10 SRX 5FF9	5.0	4.7	5.4	7.0
11 Ambassador	5.0	5.0	5.0	6.7
12 Shadow II	5.0	4.8	5.2	8.0
13 SRX 5GG9	5.0	5.0	4.9	6.7
14 FRC 2-96	4.9	4.9	4.9	6.0
15 Sandpiper	4.9	5.4	4.4	6.3
16 SR 5100	4.9	5.3	4.5	6.0
17 4EC-99	4.9	5.4	4.3	6.7
18 Bridgeport	4.8	5.4	4.3	6.3
19 Silhouette	4.8	4.7	4.9	6.0
20 Bargreen	4.7	5.0	4.3	8.0
21 New Chewing	4.5	4.1	4.9	7.0
22 FC 51	4.4	4.9	3.9	5.7
23 Barnica	4.3	5.2	3.3	6.0
24 Tiffany	4.1	4.3	4.0	6.0
25 Victory	4.1	4.0	4.1	6.7
26 FRC A-97	4.0	4.6	3.5	5.3
27 FC 50	3.6	3.2	4.0	6.7
HARD FESCUE				
1 E2H	5.8	5.5	6.1	8.3
2 ABT HF I '99	5.8	5.5	6.0	9.0
3 ABT HF I '98	5.7	5.5	5.9	8.7
4 L2H	5.5	4.9	6.1	8.3
5 Oxford	5.4	4.9	5.9	9.0

Table 5 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹			Dollar Spot ² Aug. 2001
	2000- 2001 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
HARD FESCUE (cont.)				
6 4AU-99	5.4	5.3	5.5	7.3
7 LL 22	5.4	4.9	5.8	8.7
8 Rescue 911	5.1	5.4	4.9	8.0
9 4HM-99 BS	5.1	4.6	5.6	8.7
10 Stonehenge	5.1	5.1	5.1	8.7
11 FL 54	5.1	4.6	5.6	8.0
12 Heron	5.1	4.6	5.5	8.7
13 New Hard	5.0	4.7	5.3	8.0
14 Bardur	4.9	4.7	5.0	7.3
15 SR 3100	4.8	4.4	5.3	8.3
16 Syn 49th	4.8	4.4	5.1	8.0
17 4MB-99	4.7	5.0	4.4	7.0
18 Discovery	4.6	4.3	4.8	8.3
19 Syn 4CU-99	4.5	4.4	4.6	6.7
20 4UB	4.2	3.9	4.6	7.3
21 Aurora Gold	4.0	3.7	4.4	7.3
SLENDER CREEPING RED FESCUE				
1 New Slender	4.9	4.8	5.0	3.7
2 Barcrown	4.5	4.7	4.3	3.3
3 Syn 4IT	4.4	4.8	3.9	4.7
4 Syn 453E	4.2	4.3	4.0	4.3
STRONG CREEPING RED FESCUE				
1 Pathfinder	5.3	5.0	5.6	8.3
2 4BBL	5.3	5.9	4.6	6.3
3 PK	5.2	5.3	5.1	6.7
4 Syn 4CRU	5.2	5.0	5.4	5.0
5 4676 comp	5.0	4.7	5.3	6.0
6 DW 1	5.0	4.6	5.3	3.7
7 FLE comp	5.0	4.7	5.2	8.0
8 EFL	5.0	4.6	5.3	7.0
9 Florentine	4.9	5.3	4.6	2.7
10 Fenway	4.9	4.9	4.9	8.3

Table 5 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹			Dollar Spot ² Aug. 2001
	2000- 2001 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.	
STRONG CREEPING RED FESCUE (cont.)				
11 PSC comp	4.6	4.5	4.7	3.3
12 TLS comp	4.6	4.4	4.7	3.7
13 4FR-99	4.4	4.8	4.0	2.3
14 New Strong	4.4	4.4	4.3	4.0
15 4FRR-99	4.4	4.8	4.0	3.0
16 Syn 42RR	4.4	4.7	4.0	5.3
17 47 TCL	4.3	4.2	4.4	5.7
18 Syn 4VB3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.7
19 Common Creeper	4.0	4.7	3.3	5.0
BLUE FESCUE				
1 4-Blue-99	4.3	4.4	4.2	6.7
LSD at 5% =	1.1	1.3	0.7	1.4

¹9 = best turf quality²9 = least dollar spot

Table 6. Performance of fine fescue cultivars and selections in a turf trial seeded in September 1999 at Adelphia, NJ. (Low-maintenance.)

Cultivar or Selection	Species	Turf Quality ¹		
		2000-2001 Avg.	2000 Avg.	2001 Avg.
1 New Hard	Hard	6.3	7.0	5.6
2 Heron	Hard	6.1	6.5	5.7
3 FL 54	Hard	6.1	6.1	6.0
4 LL 22	Hard	6.0	6.6	5.5
5 New Slender	Slender creeping	5.6	6.4	4.8
6 Bridgeport	Chewings	5.4	6.1	4.6
7 FC 51	Chewings	5.3	6.2	4.4
8 New Chewings	Chewings	5.2	6.3	4.2
9 Barcrown	Slender creeping	4.9	5.5	4.2
10 New Strong	Slender creeping	4.8	5.8	3.8
11 Bargreen	Chewings	4.8	5.2	4.3
12 Barnica	Chewings	4.8	5.4	4.1
13 MX-86A	Sheeps	4.6	4.9	4.2
14 Bardur	Hard	4.4	3.7	5.2
15 Des-TE	Deschampsia	3.3	4.1	2.4
16 Des-VL	Deschampsia	3.0	3.8	2.2
17 DC-710	Deschampsia	2.6	3.2	2.0
18 Deschampsia	Deschampsia	1.4	1.2	1.7
19 SPR-237	Deschampsia	1.3	1.4	1.1
LSD at 5% =		0.4	0.6	0.4

¹⁹ = best turf quality

Table 7. Performance of fine fescue cultivars and selections in a turf trial seeded in September 2000 at Adelphia, NJ.

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹	Establishment ²	Leaf Spot ³
	2001 Avg.	Sept. 2000	July 2001
CHEWINGS FESCUE			
1 COM Comp	6.3	6.7	4.0
2 COE Comp	6.1	6.3	5.7
3 C-73	5.8	6.0	4.7
4 SRX 5020	5.7	7.7	4.0
5 4601	5.7	6.0	5.0
6 SRX 51FF	5.5	6.7	4.0
7 SRX 5NJD	5.5	6.3	4.3
8 Shadow II	5.4	5.3	4.7
9 SYN 4CHU	5.4	5.7	6.7
10 SRX 5111	5.2	7.3	4.7
11 SRX 51GG	5.2	6.0	4.7
12 SUP Comp	5.2	7.7	5.0
13 00-DFRC	5.1	7.0	3.3
14 SRX 51HH	5.1	6.3	3.0
15 95M	5.0	4.7	4.0
16 Tiffany	5.0	7.3	5.0
17 Silhouette	5.0	6.0	3.3
18 FRCA 93	4.9	6.3	3.7
19 Victory 2	4.7	4.7	3.3
20 SR 5100	4.7	7.0	4.7
21 FRC-B-93	4.6	5.0	4.0
22 Sandpiper	3.9	3.0	3.3
HARD FESCUE			
1 SRX 3961	5.6	5.7	7.7
2 HOM Comp	5.4	5.0	7.3
3 E2H	5.2	4.7	7.7
4 HOE Comp	5.1	5.3	7.0
5 SRX 3324	5.0	5.0	8.3
6 SR 3100	4.8	5.3	7.7
7 SPX 35TDNE	4.7	5.0	6.3
8 Discovery	4.7	4.7	7.7
9 Osprey	4.6	6.0	8.0
10 SRX 3MOL	4.5	5.0	7.0

Table 7 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹ 2001 Avg.	Establishment ² Sept. 2000	Leaf Spot ³ July 2001
HARD FESCUE (cont.)			
11 EL 20	4.5	5.3	7.3
12 SRX 3STDE	4.4	5.7	6.3
13 LL 22	4.4	4.3	8.0
14 FL55	4.3	4.3	5.3
15 Aurora Gold	4.3	5.3	5.3
16 Heron	4.2	4.7	7.0
17 FL54	4.0	4.0	7.7
18 Spartan	4.0	4.7	6.0
SLENDER CREEPING RED FESCUE			
1 Seabreeze	4.5	7.0	4.3
2 SRX 55SLCE	4.1	6.7	4.3
3 SRX 55SLG	4.1	5.7	3.3
4 Count	3.1	5.0	4.3
5 Dawson E	1.2	1.0	7.3
STRONG CREEPING RED FESCUE			
1 TL3 Comp	5.9	6.0	5.3
2 Jasper II	5.5	8.0	4.7
3 DW2	5.4	5.0	5.3
4 TL4 Comp	5.3	5.7	4.7
5 SMX Comp	5.3	6.3	4.3
6 TL1 Comp	5.2	6.3	4.0
7 TL2 Comp	5.1	7.0	4.0
8 SRX 52961	4.8	7.0	4.0
9 SYN 4FINO	4.7	5.0	4.0
10 Jasper	4.2	5.3	4.7
11 SYN 4CRO	4.1	5.0	3.3
12 SRX 52LAV	4.0	7.0	3.3
13 SR 5200E	3.0	6.7	2.3
14 Common Creeper	2.5	8.0	1.7
BLUE FESCUE			
1 Bighorn	3.5	2.0	7.7

Table 7 (continued).

Cultivar or Selection	Turf Quality ¹ 2001 Avg.	Establishment ² Sept. 2000	Leaf Spot ³ July 2001
LSD at 5% =	0.7	1.3	1.6

¹9 = best turf quality

²9 = best establishment

³9 = least leaf spot

Table 8. Yearly nitrogen (N) applied and mowing height (Ht) on fine fescue tests established at Adelphia, North Brunswick, and Pittstown, NJ.

	1997		1998		1999		2000		2001	
	N ¹	Ht ²	N	Ht	N	Ht	N	Ht	N	Ht
Table 1 (1997 Adelphia)	1.4	1.5	2.6	1.5	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5
Table 2 (1998 Adelphia)	1.5	1.5	2.0	1.5	1.7	1.5	2.7	2.7	1.5
Table 3 (1998 North Brunswick)	1.5	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.9	1.5	2.0	2.0	1.5
Table 4 (1998 Pittstown)	1.5	3.0	1.9	3.0	1.0	2.5	1.2	2.5	1.5
Table 5 (1999 Adelphia)	1.7	1.5	2.1	2.1	1.5
Table 6 (1999 Adelphia; low-maintenance test)	0	2.5	0	2.5	2.5	1.5
Table 7 (2000 Adelphia)	2.5	1.5	2.5	1.5

¹Annual N applied (lb/1000 ft²)

²Mowing height in inches