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# Introduction

# Literature Survey

## Manually Turfgrass Evaluation[[1]](#footnote-1)

### Things to Consider

Visual ratings require consistency to ensure their merit. One person should take the data for a study. Avoid changing the person collecting visual ratings during the course of a growing season. Ideally, the same person should collect the visual ratings until the study is terminated. Keep a photographic record of treatment differences. Photos or slides are helpful in tracking treatment differences.

Before taking data, observe the study. Do you see visual differences in color, density, uniformity, disease incidence, environmental stress or other factors? If so, your visual ratings should reflect these differences. Walk around the treatments. Identify the range of differences that you see. What are the best and worst treatments? What treatments are in the middle of the range? You may wish to mark these plots to use as a reference. You can refer back to them as you rate the study, keeping your ratings as consistent as possible. This process allows you to establish your rating range for each time that you rate the treatments.

Visual ratings are based on a 1 to 9 rating scale. One is the poorest or lowest and 9 is the best or highest rating. Use as much of the rating scale as is reasonable and feasible. Base your range on the overall differences that you observe. It is important that you do not compress the rating scale. Rate only in whole numbers.

It is ideal to conduct visual evaluations on cloud-covered days, when shadows and reflections are minimal. Take data between midmorning to early afternoon, when the sun is at its highest. Keep the sun at your back. Avoid recording visual ratings on partially cloudy days. The intermittent cover causes sun flecks, and periods of brightness and shadows, making it difficult to evaluate treatment differences. It is best to have someone record data or use a data recorder. This approach speeds up the data collection and reduces glare resulting from glancing back and forth between paper and green verdure.

With some characteristics, like genetic color, differences are more evident prior to mowing. Mowing direction causes difference in light reflection and may influence color ratings. If the turf is mowed prior to rating, it is best to mow replications in the same direction. This will minimize reflection differences.

### Turfgrass Quality

Quality is based on 9 being best and 1 being poorest. A rating of 6 or above is generally considered acceptable. A quality rating value of 9 is reserved for a perfect or ideal grass, but it also can reflect an absolutely outstanding treatment plot. The NTEP requires quality ratings on a monthly basis.

Quality ratings will vary based on turfgrass species, intensity of management and time of year. Within species quality ratings are relative. Among species they are not. For example an acceptable quality rating of 6 within tall fescue cultivars is not relative to the same value given among Kentucky bluegrasses. An acceptable quality rating value for a utility turf differs from the same value for a bentgrass putting green.

Quality ratings take into account the aesthetic and functional aspects of the turf. Quality ratings are not based on color alone, but on a combination of color, density, uniformity, texture, and disease or environmental stress. Turfs growing in a study may receive the same numeric quality rating, but the factors influencing that rating may differ. For example, one turf may receive a quality rating value of 5 based on overall color and density, while another may receive the same value based on disease incidence and its impact on turfgrass density.

It is important to keep these facts in mind, when rating turfgrass quality. It is also important to keep this in mind when interpreting data from various studies.

### Genetic Color

Genetic color reflects the inherent color of the genotype. It is based on a visual rating scale with 1 being light green and 9 being dark green. Take genetic color ratings when the turf is actively growing and is not under stress. Chlorosis and browning from necrosis are not a part of genetic color.

Color charts, like those sold by the Munsell Color Company, Inc., are helpful in describing turfgrass color and serve as a reference. Color charts are useful in maintaining consistent visual color ratings.

### Turfgrass Density

Turfgrass density is a visual estimate of living plants or tillers per unit area. Dead patches of turf are excluded. A visual rating of 1 to 9 is used with 9 equaling maximum density. Turfgrass density can be determined quantitatively by counting shoots in a specified area. Counting is time consuming and labor intensive. Visual turfgrass density ratings are highly correlated to counts and require much less time and labor input. Shoot density varies by time of year. It is best to take density ratings in the spring, summer, and fall to account for seasonal variation. This is particularly true for cool-season turfgrasses.

### Percent Living Ground Cover

Percent living ground cover is based on surface area covered by the originally planted species. It is generally used to express damage caused by disease, insects, weed encroachment, or environmental stress. Percent living ground cover is often measured in the spring, summer, and fall. This timing allows one to track the turfgrass response to various stresses during the growing season.

### Turfgrass Texture

Turfgrass texture is a measure or estimate of leaf width. The visual rating of texture is based on a 1 to 9 rating scale with 1 equaling coarse and 9 equaling fine. Visual assessment of texture is difficult and less than precise. However, physical measurement is tedious, time consuming and labor intensive. Physical measurements are also variable. Care must be taken to measure leafs of similar age and stage of development. Visual ratings of texture can be used successfully to separate cultivars within species. Visual assessment of leaf texture should be done when the turfgrass is actively growing and is not under stress.

### Other Color Data

#### Spring Green-up

Green-up is a measure of the transition from winter dormancy to active spring growth. It is based on plot color not genetic color. The visual rating of spring green-up is based on a 1 to 9 rating scale with 1 being straw brown and 9 being dark green.

#### Winter Color

An assessment of color retention during the winter months. It is based on a 1 to 9 visual rating scale with 1 equaling straw brown or no color retention, and 9 equaling dark green. It assesses overall plot color and not genetic color.

#### Seasonal Color/Color Retention

Seasonal color and color retention ratings are a measure of overall plot color. The scale used is 1 to 9 scale with 1 being straw brown and 9 being dark green. Seasonal color can be used to successfully differentiate color differences based on damage caused by disease or insect pests, nutrient deficiency or environmental stress. Color retention is used to assess the ability of the entry to hold color as seasons change. This is especially useful in quantifying the response of warm-season grasses to temperature changes or frost occurring in fall.

### Other Data

#### Pest Problems

Pests include disease, insects and weeds. The NTEP reports disease and insect injury based on the turfgrass resistance, using the 1 to 9 rating scale with 1 equaling no resistance or 100% injury, and 9 equaling complete resistance or no injury. Insect incidence may also be determined as counts per unit area. Always identify disease and insects to genus and species. Verify the genus and species through the appropriate specialist (i.e. plant pathologist, entomologist, etc.). Weed infestation or encroachment is generally expressed as percent ground cover. Weeds should be identified to genus and species.

#### Environmental Stress

Stresses, like drought and winter injury, cause severe turfgrass damage. Turfgrass cultivars differ in their ability to tolerate and recover from these stresses. Drought Stress- Drought stress resistance is assessed as wilting, leaf firing, dormancy, and recovery. A 1 to 9 visual rating scale is used with 1 being complete wilting, 100% leaf firing, complete dormancy or no plant recovery; and 9 being no wilting, no leaf firing, 100% green-no dormancy, or 100% recovery.

#### Winter Injury

Freezing or direct low temperature, desiccation, and frost injury can comprise winter injury symptoms. It is important to identify the cause of the winter injury symptoms. Turfgrass species and cultivars differ in their responses to each of these stresses. Direct low temperature and desiccation injury are generally expressed as a visual estimate of percent damaged ground cover. Frost injury is expressed on a 1 to 9 rating scale with 1 equaling 100% leaf injury and 9 equaling no injury.

#### Traffic Tolerance

Traffic tolerance is the combination of wear and compaction stress that occurs whenever a turf is exposed to foot or vehicular traffic. Wear injury occurs immediately upon trafficking a turf. Wear injury symptoms are often expressed within hours and definitely within days. Compaction stress injury is more chronic. It is expressed over time. The NTEP reports traffic tolerance as visual estimate of turfgrass tolerance using a 1 to 9 rating scale with 1 being no tolerance or 100% injury, and 9 being complete tolerance or no injury.

#### Thatch Accumulation

Thatch is generally a measured value. Compressed thatch depth is preferred. It gives values with reduced variability. Collect 4, 5-cm plugs of turf-, remove the verdure; place a 1 kg weight on the surface of the thatch; and measure the compressed thatch depth in mm. Thatch accumulation measurements are time consuming and labor intensive.
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