



Blending resistant and susceptible winter wheat for wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) management  
by Debra Kay Waters

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Entomology  
Montana State University  
© Copyright by Debra Kay Waters (2003)

**Abstract:**

The wheat stems sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) has been a recurring pest of winter and spring wheat in the Northern Great Plains. Solid stem is the only host plant resistance factor that has been identified in wheat for wheat stem sawfly (WSS) management. Resistant (solid stem) winter and spring wheat varieties are available but are not widely accepted by producers because of reduced yield and protein, reduced disease resistance, and lower winter survival (winter wheat) compared with the susceptible (hollow stems) varieties. Blending of resistant and susceptible wheat cultivars may be a useful tool in managing losses from wheat stem sawfly yield losses due to feeding and cutting of the stem yet improving agronomic traits. Rampart released in 1997, was blended with two susceptible varieties of winter wheat, Rocky and Norstar, at two field locations in 1997 and three locations in 1998. Wheat stem sawfly populations were relatively low for both sites in 1997 and ranged from low to extremely high for the 3 sites in 1998 allowing for a comparison of blend treatments under varying degrees of WSS pressure. In the Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends there were no differences detected among the treatments for egg deposition preference. There were no consistent differences in larval numbers between blend treatments by the last sample date for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends at all sites. Yields were not different for the Rocky: Rampart blend treatments for all sites except one site where 100% Rampart yielded higher than all other blends. There were no significant differences in yield across all blend treatments for Norstar: Rampart blends at all sites. Protein varied among treatments across sites. There was no definitive pattern for protein differences for the Rocky: Rampart blends. Predicting for the WSS infestation were positively related and correlated highly to the peak number of WSS per sweep indicating the importance of a regular WSS monitoring program that included adult WSS flight duration and peak number of adults which could provide valuable information about later WSS larval infestation.

BLENDING RESISTANT AND SUSCEPTIBLE WINTER WHEAT FOR WHEAT  
STEM SAWFLY (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) MANAGEMENT

by

Debra Kay Waters

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

of

Master of Science

in


Entomology

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY  
Bozeman, Montana


April 2003

APPROVAL  
of a thesis submitted by  
Debra Kay Waters


This thesis has been read by each member of the thesis committee and has been found to be satisfactory regarding content, English usage, format, citations, bibliographic style, and consistency, and is ready for submission to the College of Graduate Studies.

Dr. Sue L. Blodgett  21 April 03  
(Signature) (Date)

Approved for the Department of Entomology

Dr. Gregory D. Johnson  4-21-03  
(Signature) (Date)

Approved for the College of Graduate Studies

Dr. Bruce R. McLeod  4-29-03  
(Signature) (Date)

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a master's degree at Montana State University-Bozeman, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

If I have indicated my intention to copyright this thesis by including a copyright notice page, copying is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this thesis in whole or parts may be granted only by the copyright holder.

Signature

*Nelia Kay Waters*

Date

*4/21/03*

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I would like to thank my major advisor, Dr. Sue Blodgett, for helping throughout the long process of writing this thesis. Without her patience and willingness to help by encouragement and guidance I would have not reached this goal. I would also like to thank the other members of my committee: Drs. Greg Johnson, Wendell Morrill, and Phil Bruckner for their advice, expertise, encouragement and patience.

I would like to thank Dr. Patty Denke for her invaluable assistance in the lab and for putting up with my dirty material. A special thanks to Kenny Kever an excellent assistant to whom I relied on extensively. Many thanks to the numerous lab technicians for their long hours and diligent work processing the seemingly endless samples, Rachele Waters, Ben Larson, Katherine Miller, Amy Webb to name a few.

I gratefully acknowledge the technical support by Gregg R. Carlson, Northern Agricultural Research Center, Dave Wichman, Central Agricultural Research Center, Ken Kephart, and Southern Agricultural Research Center. I thank Jim Berg for his advice and assistance especially in preparing for the first fall seeding in 1996. A special thanks to the cooperator farmers: Bud and Larry Myers, Big Sandy, MT; Richard Swartz, Broadview, MT; Lyle McKeever, Loma, MT; and Dave Kelsey, Molt, MT. Thank you to Montana Wheat and Barley Committee for the grant funding.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. LITERATURE REVIEW.....	5
Wheat Stem Sawfly Taxonomy.....	5
Wheat Stem Sawfly Description .....	7
Wheat Stem Sawfly Lifecycle.....	9
Adult.....	9
Egg .....	11
Larvae.....	12
Pupae .....	14
Wheat Stem Sawfly History of Importance .....	16
United States .....	16
Canada.....	19
Wheat Stem Sawfly Management.....	21
Cultural Control.....	22
Biological Control.....	27
Host Plant Resistance.....	29
3. INTRODUCTION.....	33
4. MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	37
Site Descriptions and Locations.....	37
Wheat Cultivar Selection for Experimental Blends .....	38
Plant Maturity.....	38
Milling and Baking Qualities .....	39
Chaff Color.....	39
Yield.....	39
Hollow Stem Cultivar Selection.....	40
Solid Stem Cultivar Selection .....	40
Plot Design .....	42
Seeding Preparation.....	42
Sampling Methods.....	42
5. RESULTS.....	45
Blend Analysis for Rocky: Rampart .....	45
Big Sandy, Montana 1997.....	45

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Eggs.....	45
Larvae.....	45
Broadview, Montana 1997 .....	46
Eggs.....	50
Larvae.....	50
Big Sandy, Montana 1998.....	50
Eggs.....	54
Larvae.....	54
Loma, Montana 1998 .....	54
Eggs.....	58
Larvae.....	58
Molt, Montana 1998.....	59
Eggs.....	59
Larvae.....	63
Blend Analysis for Norstar: Rampart.....	63
Big Sandy, Montana 1997.....	63
Eggs.....	67
Larvae.....	67
Broadview, Montana 1997 .....	71
Eggs.....	71
Larvae .....	71
Big Sandy, Montana 1998.....	72
Eggs.....	72
Larvae.....	76
Loma, Montana 1998 .....	76
Eggs.....	80
Larvae .....	80
Molt, Montana 1998.....	80
Eggs.....	84
Larvae.....	84
Pre and Post Harvest Percent WSS Cut Stems Analysis.....	88
Rocky: Rampart.....	88
Norstar: Rampart.....	88
Yield and Protein Analysis.....	90
Rocky: Rampart.....	90
Yield .....	90
Protein .....	90
Norstar: Rampart.....	93
Yield .....	93
Protein .....	93

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

6. DISCUSSION .....	96
Cultivar Blends.....	96
Wheat Stem Sawfly Populations .....	96
Blends.....	97
Eggs.....	98
Larvae.....	99
Predicting Late Season WSS Larval Infestation .....	99
Yield.....	102
LITERATURE CITED .....	104
APPENDICES.....	116
APPENDIX A: Cereal Grain Development Stages by Zadoks (Zadoks 1974) .....	117
APPENDIX B: Summary of DATE and DATE X TREATMENT Effects in the Repeated Measures Analysis with Time as the Repeated Function .....	119
APPENDIX C: Complete Data Set for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart Blends for 1997 and 1998 .....	121

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Agronomic and quality characteristics of selected hollow and solid stemmed winter wheat cultivars.....	41
2. Yield comparisons between selected hollow and solid stemmed cultivars from Havre, Montana.....	41
3. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	48
4. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	48
5. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana 1997.....	52
6. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana 1997.....	52
7. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	56
8. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	56
9. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky	

and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998 .....	61
10. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998 .....	61
11. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998 .....	65
12. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998 .....	65
13. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	69
14. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	69
15. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana 1997.....	74
16. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana 1997.....	74
17. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	78

18. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	78
19. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998 .....	82
20. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998 .....	82
21. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998 .....	86
22. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 19978 .....	86
23. Percent of wheat stem sawfly cut stems ( $\pm$ SE), pre and post harvest for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years .....	89
24. Percent of wheat stem sawfly cut stems ( $\pm$ SE), pre and post harvest for Norstar: Rampart blends at five locations and two years .....	89
25. Kilograms per hectare ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.....	91
26. Mean percent protein ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.....	92
27. Kilograms per hectare ( $\pm$ SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends at five locations and two year .....	94
28. Mean percent protein ( $\pm$ SE) of Norstar: Rampart blends at	

five locations and two years..... 95

29. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for Rocky: Rampart blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.19(\text{adult flight duration}) + 0.24(\text{peak numbers of WSS adults per sweep})$  ..... 101

30. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for Norstar: Rampart blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.866(\text{peak numbers of WSS adults per sweep})$  ..... 101

31. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for both Rocky and Norstar blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.17(\text{flight duration in days}) + 0.43(\text{peak WSS adults per sweep})$  ..... 102

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	47
2. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	49
3. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Broadview, Montana, 1997 .....	51
4. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Broadview, Montana 1997 .....	53
5. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	55
6. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1998 .....	57
7. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Loma, Montana 1998.....	60
8. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Loma, Montana 1998.....	62
9. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Molt, Montana 1998 .....	64
10. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Molt, Montana 1998 .....	66
11. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana 1997 .....	68
12. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Big Sandy,	

Montana 1997 ..... 70

13. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult at Broadview, Montana 1997 ..... 73

14. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Broadview, Montana 1997 ..... 75

15. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana 1998 ..... 77

16. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1998 ..... 79

17. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Loma, Montana 1998..... 81

18. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Loma, Montana 1998 ..... 83

19. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Molt, Montana 1998 ..... 85

20. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Molt, Montana 1998 ..... 87

## ABSTRACT

The wheat stems sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) has been a recurring pest of winter and spring wheat in the Northern Great Plains. Solid stem is the only host plant resistance factor that has been identified in wheat for wheat stem sawfly (WSS) management. Resistant (solid stem) winter and spring wheat varieties are available but are not widely accepted by producers because of reduced yield and protein, reduced disease resistance, and lower winter survival (winter wheat) compared with the susceptible (hollow stems) varieties. Blending of resistant and susceptible wheat cultivars may be a useful tool in managing losses from wheat stem sawfly yield losses due to feeding and cutting of the stem yet improving agronomic traits. Rampart released in 1997, was blended with two susceptible varieties of winter wheat, Rocky and Norstar, at two field locations in 1997 and three locations in 1998. Wheat stem sawfly populations were relatively low for both sites in 1997 and ranged from low to extremely high for the 3 sites in 1998 allowing for a comparison of blend treatments under varying degrees of WSS pressure. In the Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends there were no differences detected among the treatments for egg deposition preference. There were no consistent differences in larval numbers between blend treatments by the last sample date for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends at all sites. Yields were not different for the Rocky: Rampart blend treatments for all sites except one site where 100% Rampart yielded higher than all other blends. There were no significant differences in yield across all blend treatments for Norstar: Rampart blends at all sites. Protein varied among treatments across sites. There was no definitive pattern for protein differences for the Rocky: Rampart blends. Predicting for the WSS infestation were positively related and correlated highly to the peak number of WSS per sweep indicating the importance of a regular WSS monitoring program that included adult WSS flight duration and peak number of adults which could provide valuable information about later WSS larval infestation.

## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

The establishment of the Homestead Act in 1862, allowed large numbers of acres to be plowed and planted to spring wheat in the Northern Great Plains. Wheat and grasses have a similar growth cycle and both remain green during wheat stem sawfly (WSS) larval development. This provided conditions favorable for the transfer of WSS from grasses to wheat.

The WSS was first found in the United States in native and resident grass species in Colorado, Nevada, and California, although the primary hosts at the beginning of the century were native grasses. An interest in the wheat stem sawfly as a potential agricultural pest in cereal grains occurred around 1900. With the introduction and expansion of cereal grains into the range of WSS, wheat was suitable, abundant, and offered an accessible alternative host. Spring wheat was the primary cereal grain to be impacted by the WSS but recently winter wheat has sustained increased damage and infestation. The wheat stem sawfly, has become a major recurring wheat pest in Montana and the Northern Great Plains causing loss of quality and yield. Larvae feeding within the stem, can cause 10.8-22.3% grain yield loss and 0.6-1.2% protein reduction of the grain head (Holmes 1977). Additionally, larvae cutting lower portions of the stems following feeding caused stems to break prior to harvest and grain heads to be lost. Montana producers have estimated direct grain yield losses at \$25-30 million per year due to sawfly cutting (Blodgett 1996, Montana State University Extension Service 1997).

These losses do not include an increase in custom harvest cost or equipment damage and modifications resulting from harvesting a WSS infested field.

The wheat stem sawfly has been the subject of major studies because of the damage it causes and ineffective control measures. Since the early 1900's many farm management practices were introduced, tried and discarded and have been reexamined in recent years. In the 1920's recommendations for control of WSS was burning stubble, mowing ditches and field edge grasses, deep tillage, use of trap strips and rotating to certain resistant crops (Ainslie 1920, 1929). Burning stubble had no effect on larval mortality because stems cut near ground level were protected and insulated by the soil. Mowing grasses on field edges and ditches eliminated potentially infested grass stems, but also reduced the number of natural parasites of WSS that utilize native grass species. Deep tillage of the stubble (min. of 15.2 cm) and compaction of the soil reduced sawfly populations by 35%, but is not a practice recommended for Montana, the Dakotas, and Canada because of the high potential for soil erosion (Ainslie 1920, 1929). Trap strips of susceptible crops were utilized as a sink for sawfly oviposition. The strips were then cut for hay following sawfly oviposition to destroy the eggs and larvae. The disadvantage of this method of control was expense in time, labor, loss of crop and yield acreage, and difficulty in marketing forage from trap crops such as oats, flax, and barley (Anonymous 1946). Shallow tillage after harvest from late summer to early fall (Farstad 1942), or spring using one-way disk or duck-foot cultivators (Holmes and Farstad 1956) was dependent on exposure of stubs to extreme weather condition causing desiccation and mortality. The drawbacks of shallow tillage in fall and spring was added time, labor and

machinery costs, reduction of soil moisture from cultivation, loss of surface residue due to incorporation, and limited success if timing of tillage operation did not expose stems. A recommended practice in fields prone to high infestation was delaying spring wheat seeding until after May 20<sup>th</sup>, thus avoiding WSS infestation due to immature wheat development (Callenbach and Hansmeier 1944). The results confirmed that planting after May 18 was not economical and resulted in reduced wheat yields. A study was conducted using swathing as a method of minimizing cutting damage to wheat and reducing overwintering populations of the WSS while preventing grain yield and quality losses (Goosey 1999). Swathing at 40-48% moisture level used with other management methods could reduce overwintering larval population. The disadvantage is added labor, machinery, and time involved in incorporating this technique. However, in addition to benefit in minimizing WSS cutting damage, this technique also aids in uniform drying of the crop and has found favor with some producers. Insecticides have been examined as a possible control measure since the 1940's. From the 1940 to 1960's various insecticides have been applied as dusts, sprays, and granular applications, in seed, furrow, broadcast, and foliar treatments, however, no insecticide has been effective in consistently controlling the WSS (Holmes and Hurtig 1952, Wallace 1962, Blodgett, MSU, personal observation).

The management technique which has been the most effective, has been the identification of a resistant solid stem characteristic, parenchyma filled wheat stems, which offered a possible means of controlling the WSS. This characteristic was bred into the spring wheat varieties, "Rescue" and "Chinook", in 1938 (Platt and Farstad 1953,

Taylor 1976). These and other solid stem spring wheat varieties have allowed producers to grow resistant spring wheat in WSS infested areas. However with the relatively recent shift of WSS into winter wheat, producers have sustained significant damage due to WSS. In 1995 and 1996 two resistant winter wheat varieties 'Vanguard' and 'Rampart' were released which integrated the solid stem characteristic from spring wheat (Bruckner et al. 1997, Carlson et al. 1997).

The wheat stem sawfly, (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) [Hymenoptera: Cephidae] is a holometabolous insect with one complete generation a year. The life cycle of the WSS is synchronized with the physiological development of the host plants. All the developmental stages occur within the confines of a grass stem except the adult stage. WSS adults emerge from previous years infested wheat in late May through the third week in July for most areas in Montana, Northwestern North Dakota and Canada (Criddle 1915, 1923, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Weiss et al. 1990, Weiss and Morrill 1992, Morrill and Kushnak 1996, Shanower unpublished data 2000). This adult emergence interval coincides with wheat development stages ranging from stem elongation through anthesis. The female WSS insert eggs within the grass stems with egg hatch occurring within 5-7 days. Larvae feed near the oviposition site, eventually working up and down the inside of the stem chewing through the nodes. When the plant begins to mature and dry, the surviving larva descends toward the base of the stem to prepare a site for diapause. The larva overwinter in the base of the grass stem protected from adverse conditions such as desiccation, light and exposure. Pupal development is initiated in the spring with adult emergence following shortly.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Wheat Stem Sawfly Taxonomy

*Cephus cinctus* Norton, wheat stem sawfly (WSS), is in the Order Hymenoptera, Family Cephidae. Hymenoptera have four membranous wings with the front wings larger than the hind wings. A row of tiny hooks (hamuli) attaches the hind wing to a fold on the front wings. The wings have relatively few or no veins at all. There is a well-developed ovipositor sometimes modified into a stinging organ. An abdomen that is broadly joined at the thorax, two-segmented trochanter, and three submarginal cells in hind wings characterizes the suborder Symphyta. Nearly all the Symphyta are phytophagous and have a single generation a year including *C. cinctus* (Borror et al. 1992).

The Family Cephidae contains stem sawflies in which the larvae bore and feed in grass stems, or stems and twigs of trees and shrubs. The adults are slender, laterally compressed sawflies and the larvae overwinter in a cocoon within the plant host. The thorax has two pairs of spiracles near wing bases. Antennae are near the middle of the face above the base of the eyes and the front tibia has one apical spur. There are 13 genera and about 100 species known in the world. *Cephus cinctus* feeds within grass stems and is a serious pest of cultivated grains (Wallace and McNeal 1966, Smith 1979, Borror et al. 1992). There are 25-30 world species in the Genus *Cephus* but only two are found in North America, *C. cinctus* Norton found in western United States and Canada and *C. pygmaeus* (L.) eastern United States and Canada (Smith 1979).

Both *C. cinctus* Norton (wheat stem sawfly) and *C. pygmaeus* (L.) (European wheat stem sawfly) are important wheat pests in the United States. They are similar in appearance and life cycles but differ in areas of habitat. *Cephus cinctus* was first described in 1872 by Edward Norton based on male specimens collected in Colorado and cotypes in Nevada and California. *Cephus cinctus* is found in grasses west of the Mississippi and north of the 36° parallel. WSS causes major economic losses in wheat (*Triticum* spp.) in the Northern Great Plains region that includes Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming, Nebraska, and neighboring provinces in Canada (Webster and Reeves 1910, Ainslie 1920 1929, Davis 1957, Wallace and McNeal 1966). *Cephus pygmaeus* was found in Ontario and New York in the 1880's, an unintentional introduction from Europe and Eurasia. *Cephus pygmaeus* inhabits the northeastern United States and eastern Canada but is not a major economic pest due to successful introduction of parasitoids in the 1930's (Udine 1941, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Smith 1979). There are two other synonyms for *Cephus cinctus*, *Cephus occidentalis* Riley and Marlatt, 1891 and *Cephus graenicheri* Ashmead, 1898 (Wallace and McNeal 1966, Smith 1979).

### Wheat Stem Sawfly Description

The original description of 24 females and 14 males from California, Nevada and Montana of *Cephus occidentalis* synonym of *C. cinctus* by Riley and Marlatt (1891) is as follows:

“The adult insect agrees almost exactly with *Cephus pygmaeus* in coloration, coming much closer to it in this respect than to any other American species, but is in every way more slender and graceful and would never be mistaken for the European species. The head is narrower in proportion to the body and is more globular when viewed from the side. Viewed from above it narrows more posteriorly from the eyes than *pygmaeus*.

Female: Black; basal joints of the maxillary palpi, large yellow spot on mandibles, two spots beneath anterior wings, membranous regions of thorax, small spot on lower posterior edge of dorsum of first segment, larger one on second segment. Band dentate on basal margin on apical half of dorsum of third, fifth and sixth segments, and more less of the lower and apical margin of the remaining segments lemon yellow. Legs black, slender; spot on posterior coxae above upper side and tip of femora yellow; tibiae and tarsi reddish yellow except tips of posterior tibiae and their tarsi, which are brownish; last joint and claws of middle and anterior tarsi also brownish. Antennae 20-21 jointed, longer than head and thorax, slender to joint 7 beyond which the articles are shorter and thickened. Wings slightly smoky; veins brown except costal and margin of sigma which are yellowish; a small infuscated spot at base of discoidal vein; second recurrent vein joins the third submarginal cell near the base of the cell; cross veins of lanceolate cell slightly curved and oblique. Abdomen not much longer than head and thorax, strongly compressed laterally. Length, 9-11 mm.

Male: smaller and more slender than the female; abdomen less compressed; antennae 18-21 jointed. Coloration as in female except a large spot on the clypeus, one just below the eyes in front, the entire pectal region of the thorax and the posterior margin of the third, fifth, and remaining ventral segments which are lemon yellow. The under side of the coxae, trochanter, and femora, including the apex of the latter above are lemon yellow; the tibiae and tarsi are as in the case of the female. In some specimens the femora are entirely yellow or with a narrow black line on the anterior pair above, and the yellow band on the third ventral segment is occasionally obsolete. Length, 8-9 mm.”

Additional descriptive identification of the adult WSS includes the following; the dorsal view of the pronotum is trapezoidal in shape, as wide as long. The front tibia has one apical spur without pectination on inner margin (Borror et al. 1992). The female

ovipositor is well-developed and composed of two pairs of laterally compressed appendages with serrated teeth at tip on dorsal side and two rows on ventral side. The ovipositor is enclosed in a sheath and protrudes from the eighth and ninth sternites (Ainslie 1920,1929, Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Differences in adult body color distinguish *C. cinctus* and *C. pygmaeus*. *C. cinctus* has a more pronounced yellow markings on the black body compared to *C. pygmaeus*. Taxonomic key to adult stem sawflies of United States by Ries (1926), describes differences between the two species:

“Abdomen with dorsal, transverse, yellow bands; ovipositor sheaths when viewed dorsally, not swollen or laterally enlarged toward their apices; males without horseshoe-shaped depressions on last two apical ventral segments----- 2

Sigma and costa dark brown, of uniform color; mesepisternum black; femora black; apical tergite and venter black; face and scutellum black (face of male with yellow spots)----- *Cephus pygmaeus* (L.)

Stigma in greater part and costa yellow; mesepisternum with upper angle yellow; femora mostly yellow; apical tergite and usually venter in part yellow; face and scutellum of female usually black but occasionally with yellow spots-----*Cephus cinctus* Norton”

The distinguishing larval characteristics of *C. cinctus* and *C. pygmaeus* are more difficult. The following taxonomic key by Gahan, (1920) distinguishes between the larvae of the two species:

“Dorsal anal lobe of 10<sup>th</sup> tergite, viewed from side, triangular, sloping gradually from base to apex, and anterior end of lobe much thicker than posterior end, which is more or less acute. Spines on anal prong each arising from small, more or less chitinized tubercle and closely grouped about apex of enlarged fleshy part just basad of short chitinized apical ring. Eighth and ninth tergites apparently glabrous----- 2

Anal prong terminating in short chitinized ring, which is not as long as broad. Spines basad of chitinized ring few in number, confined to single transverse row on dorsal surface. Dorsal, lateral, and ventral lobes sparsely hairy----*Cephus pygmaeus* (L.)

Anal prong terminating in chitinized tube-like process, which is distinctly longer than broad. Spines basad of apical tube-like process numerous, arranged in two irregular contiguous series completely encircling base of tube. Anal lobes distinctly hairy-----*Cephus cinctus* Norton”

### Wheat Stem Sawfly Life Cycle

The wheat stem sawfly is a holometabolous insect with one complete generation a year. The life cycle of the WSS is synchronized with the physiological development of the host plants. All the developmental stages occur within the confines of a grass stem except the adult stage.

#### Adult

WSS adults emerge late May to late June and may continue until the third week in July for areas in Montana, northwestern North Dakota and Canada (Criddle 1915, 1923, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Weiss et al. 1990, Weiss and Morrill 1992, Morrill and Kushnak 1996, Shanower unpublished data 2000). Adult emergence is synchronous with the physiological development of the grass hosts because female WSS choose to oviposit in developing stems of certain diameter, during certain plant growth stages. Plant developmental stages that are suitable for WSS oviposition begin at stem elongation through anthesis (Zadoks 32-69). Ovipositing WSS females require the presence of an internode or the stem will be rejected for a more suitable host. Anthesis usually marks the end of the oviposition period due to the increasing maturity of the tissue preventing insertion of the ovipositor. Younger more succulent stem tissue is desirable for the insertion of the ovipositor for egg deposition (Criddle 1923).

Weather, soil temperature, and soil moisture has an effect on adult emergence, longevity, and duration of flight (Seamans 1945, Wallace and McNeal 1966). The WSS adult chews through the frass that plugs the overwintering chamber and emerges in late

May to late June. Ideal conditions for emergence are a warm moist May, hot June with sufficient moisture for plant growth and dry weather for flight (Seamans 1945).

Adults are most active on calm, sunny days at temperatures that range from 17°C to 32°C. Activity declines or terminates during cloudy, windy, wet and rainy conditions and at temperatures less than 17°C (Seamans 1945). Duration of WSS flight is also effected by weather, soil moisture and soil temperature. Excessive hot windy conditions shorten the emergence period while moderate environmental conditions allow emergence to continue until late July (Wallace and McNeal 1966). The average lifespan of the WSS adult is 5-8 days with maximum lifespan of 12-16 days, depending upon available moisture and climatic conditions (Criddle 1923, Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Male WSS generally emerge first and congregate on grass stems near field edges waiting to mate with emerging females (Weiss and Morrill 1985). Females take flight soon after emerging in search of suitable hosts to oviposit eggs. Mating is not required for the production of viable eggs or egg development; the WSS female reproduces by a type of parthenogenesis, arrhenotoky (haplo-diploid), in which fertilization determines the sex of the developing WSS. In arrhenotokous population, unfertilized eggs develop into haploid males and fertilized eggs mostly produce diploid females however, infrequently azygous diploid females occur. The diploid female has 18 chromosomes and the haploid male has 9 chromosomes (MacKay 1955). A thelytokous population was reported among areas of infestation with bisexual populations, near Lethbridge, Canada in 1936-37. In the thelytokous population, unfertilized eggs produced diploid females, no males were found and diploid males were rare (Farstad 1938, MacKay 1955).

Mutations from a bisexual race or natural selection of diploid azygote isolates arising from haploid parthenogenesis may be responsible for this phenomenon (MacKay 1955).

The female WSS reproductive organs consist of paired ovaries containing seven polytrophic ovarioles in each ovary. Embryonic development of seven eggs can be seen in each ovariole but only three reach maturity in the adult female. The female WSS on average has an egg laying potential of forty eggs during her lifetime (MacKay 1955).

The female prefers the uppermost internode of an elongating stem with a diameter of 2.8-3.4 mm to deposit her eggs (Holmes and Peterson 1960). Grasses are susceptible to WSS oviposition at growth stages ranging from Zadoks 32 (stem elongation) through 69 (anthesis) (Holmes and Peterson 1960, Zadoks et al. 1974). The female WSS tests the suitability of a grass stem by moving, in a head down position, down the stem locating a suitable spot to insert the ovipositor. Once a site has been chosen, the female abdomen is drawn up under the body and an attempt is made to insert the saw-like ovipositor. The ovipositor is forced between the cells of the stem tissue causing a minutely visible oviposition scar. If the spot is suitable the ovipositor is inserted and withdrawn several times before one egg is inserted (Wallace and McNeal 1966). Each female lay only one egg per stem (Ainslie 1920) but egg lay by more than one female is common.

### Egg

Newly laid eggs are an opaque, milky white color with tapered, rounded ends. The nearly symmetrical eggs range in size from 1-1.25 mm long and 0.33-0.42 mm wide (Ainslie 1920, 1929).

The egg stage is 5-7 days in length. During the first day the milky white content shrinks within the thin egg sac leaving a space or vacuole. Cells are visibly arranging along a central axis during the second day. By the third day the form of the larva is visible and abdominal segments well defined. The transparent head fills one end of the egg sac with the body looped or folded beneath the abdomen. An intermittent heartbeat is detectable in the fourth day of development. The heart becomes more regular with about 120 impulses per minute and the mandibles and eyespots began to darken during the fifth day. The fifth, sixth and seventh days show an increase of activity within the egg sac with subsequent escape from the egg sac by a series of convulsive movements (Ainslie 1920, Wallace and McNeal 1966).

### Larvae

Shortly after emerging from the egg casing the head capsule, mandibles and eyespots sclerotize and darken resulting in a light brown head capsule and dark brown mandibles and eyespots. The remaining body is transparent and colorless developing from milky white to yellow color as feeding begins. The mandibles have well-developed molar and incisors for chewing and biting (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Holmes 1954, Maxwell 1955). The larval type is eruciform, soft-bodied, cylindrical, and resembles Lepidoptera caterpillars but do not have the specialized crochets on the prolegs (Borror et al. 1992). The first two segments of the abdomen are swollen, with a short blunt point at the posterior end of the body (Criddle 1915). The pygidium also has stiff bristles that aid in movement up and down within the stem. The head and last thoracic segment are sparsely covered with hairs (Ainslie 1920, 1929,

Wallace and McNeal 1966). Ainslie (1920) noted that larvae size is variable but recorded an average length of 2.24 mm and width of 0.54 mm.

Feeding begins as soon as the mandibles harden and are capable of chewing. The larvae begin feeding initially near the oviposition site, eventually working up and down the stem chewing through the nodes. The pygidium aids in the ability to turn and move in the stem and also supports the body when feeding. As the larvae feeds upon the stem pith, comprised of parenchyma and vascular tissue, it fills the stem with excreted partially digested plant tissue called 'frass' (Holmes 1954). The larvae exhibit cannibalistic behavior resulting in direct competition between earlier emerging larvae and later laid eggs and emerging larvae. The outcome is the survival of one larva per stem (Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Larval development includes at least four and possibly five instars, but instars are difficult to determine due to ingestion of skin castings and frass within the stem (Ainslie 1920, Taylor 1931, Farstad 1940).

When the plant begins to mature and dry, the surviving larva descends toward the base of the stem to prepare a site for diapause. Holmes (1975) found that movement toward the base of the stem is in response to infrared and visible light emitted through the mature drying stem. The larva chews around the inside of the stem cutting almost through existing stem tissue, resulting in 'girdling'. The lower three to six millimeters of the stem termed a 'stub', is plugged with 'frass' just below the girdled notch. This rigid plug prevents the stem from bending, breaking, or collapsing below the girdled notch which would compromise the integrity of the larva, and influence its mortality. After girdling

and plugging the stem, the larva constructs a cocoon like sac within the hollow stem. The sac is a clear thin cellophane-like material that is secreted by the labium, drying to a transparent brown casing. It is attached to the frass plug and fills the stub, forming a free hanging sac. The sac protects the larval and pupal stages from desiccation and excessive moisture conditions (Wallace and McNeal 1966). The cocoon allows some freedom of movement within the stub and serves as a hibernaculum for the obligatory diapause stage (Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Cutting of the stem and subsequent diapause occurs in response to stem moisture loss as tissues mature, which can result in desiccation of the larvae (Holmes 1975). Any condition that delays the maturing or ripening of the stem such as delayed planting date, excess soil moisture, and/or lower temperatures result in the delay of stem cutting (Holmes et al. 1963). Excess soil moisture can result in a cut higher than ground level because of residual stem moisture in lower internodes (Holmes 1975). Overwintering in the base of the grass stem ensures the larva is protected from adverse conditions such as desiccation, light and exposure.

Diapause is initiated shortly after the cocoon is formed, lasting for a period of about ten months extending from harvest through spring. Development is arrested and metabolic processes are reduced during this time. Diapause is terminated in the spring when temperature conditions 10°C or greater are attained (Salt 1946, 1947).

### Pupae

A cold period is required for initiation of pupal development. Salt (1947) concluded that 10°C for 90 days is the minimum cold period requirement. Pupal

development according to Criddle (1923) is estimated to last 16 days depending on climatic and environmental conditions. For example, weather, soil temperature and moisture effects pupal development. Exposure of stubs to continuous light and high temperatures (35°C) results in malformed pupae and adults, diapause reinitiation in postdiapause larvae, and mortality of prepupae and pupal stages (Church 1955, Holmes and Farstad 1956, Villacorta et al. 1971). There must be adequate moisture in the spring for pupal development and to prevent mortality due to desiccation (Wallace and McNeal 1966).

The pupae are pale, milky white in color and exarate in form, appearing motionless but capable of movement within the cocoon. As pupal development progresses wings develop fully, eyes darken and gradual pigmentation of the body takes place resulting in a fully formed adult (Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Wheat Stem Sawfly History of Importance

*Cephus cinctus* was first described in 1872 by Norton based on male specimens collected from grasses in Colorado and co-types in Nevada and California (Wallace and McNeal 1966). In 1890, Koebele found larvae in grass stems near Alameda, California that were reared to adults and identified by Riley and Marlatt in 1891 along with specimens from Nevada and Montana as *C. occidentalis* a synonym of *C. cinctus*. A prediction made at this time, was based on the feeding habits and potential for host shifting of the grass-stem sawfly, stating: "The economic importance of this species arises from the fact that it may be expected at anytime to abandon its natural food-plant in favor of the small grains, on which it can doubtless successfully develop." (Ainslie 1920). Less than five years later, in 1895, *C. cinctus* adults and larvae were found infesting spring wheat in Souris, Manitoba (Ainslie 1920, 1929) and Moosejaw, Saskatchewan Canada (Wallace and McNeal 1966). In 1900 WSS was found infesting grasses in Bozeman, Montana. From 1902-1906 WSS was reportedly found in grass plants, primarily *Agropyron* spp., from the Northwest Territories as far south as the Dakotas and Wyoming (Ainslie 1920).

United States

The establishment of the Homestead Act in 1862, allowed large numbers of acres to be plowed and planted to spring wheat in the Northern Great Plains. Between 1900 and 1925 wheat acreage increased from 116,640 to 2,691,630 million hectares

(Hargreaves 1993). This resulted in large tracts of land, devoted to wheat production, providing an opportunity for WSS to shift hosts from grasses to cultivated small grains.

In 1906, *C. cinctus* larvae were found in spring wheat at Kulm, North Dakota (Ainslie 1920). In 1907 larvae and stem damaged spring wheat stems were found in central Manitoba, Southeastern Saskatchewan, Canada, and Minot, North Dakota (Ainslie 1920). Larvae were found in grasses in Oregon in 1908 (Ainslie 1920). WSS damage to spring wheat crops averaged 5-25% to as high as 66% from Minot, North Dakota and north into Canada in 1909. In 1910, total devastation of most of the spring wheat crop was reported in Bainville, Montana (Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Ainslie began determining the WSS distribution in the United States in 1911 (Wallace and McNeal 1966). From 1913-1915 Ainslie (1920) surveyed WSS infestation in grass species throughout the Dakotas and Minnesota. Ainslie found that the larger stemmed grasses were the preferred hosts of WSS, this included *Elymus* sp., timothy (*Phleum pratense*), *Agropyron* spp., and *Bromus* spp. Slender stemmed species such as bluegrass (*Poa* sp.) appeared to have immunity to WSS infestation (Ainslie 1920, 1929). In 1916 Ainslie (1920), found larvae in spring wheat stems in North Dakota counties, Bottineau, Benson, Pierce, McHenry and Rolette expanding to Hettinger, Towner and Cavalier in 1917. In Bottineau County, the percentage of cut spring wheat stems from WSS was greater than 60%, an estimate of 294,030 to 526,500 WSS infested stubs per hectare. By 1920, the distribution of *C. cinctus*, in wheat, had expanded north into neighboring provinces of Canada, east to the Mississippi River, south to the 36° parallel and west to the Pacific Ocean (Ainslie 1920, 1929).

From 1923 to 1943 almost all areas east of the Rockies including North Dakota reported infestations in spring wheat. Forty counties in South Dakota and a large number of counties in Wyoming also experienced crop damage. The heaviest infestation occurred in northern Montana, as much as 80% damage was reported (Anonymous 1946). Sawfly damage in Montana and North Dakota increased from 1943 to 1952. A damage survey conducted in 1952 estimated spring wheat losses in North Dakota and Montana at \$17 million (Davis 1955).

The WSS has historically been successful in shifting from grass hosts to spring wheat in the hard red spring wheat growing areas, Canada, Montana, North Dakota, northern Wyoming and northern South Dakota with economic damage recorded in Montana and North Dakota (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Davis 1955). In southern Wyoming and South Dakota, Davis (1955) found the WSS had been less successful in shifting to infesting winter wheat, possibly due to lack of host/insect synchronization. In South Dakota WSS infested winter wheat plants matured before larval growth and development was completed causing considerable mortality of the WSS (Davis 1955). Further south in the central Great Plains, (southern Wyoming, Nebraska, Colorado, Kansas), winter wheat escaped infestation due to the early maturing of the wheat plant (Painter 1953, Wallace and McNeal 1966).

Until the 1960's, spring wheat was the dominant wheat grown in Montana. From 1960 to present, winter wheat acres have increased to equal that of spring wheat. With the increase of winter wheat acreage widespread losses due to WSS became more evident, beginning in 1985 (Morrill 1985). In 1997, infestation levels in winter wheat

ranged from 33-96% in areas of Montana (Morrill 1997). Morrill and Kushnak (1996) determined that the wheat stem sawfly adapted to and synchronized with winter wheat development in Montana. The mean reported date of emergence of the WSS before 1970 was June 20, (Morrill and Kushnak 1996) compared to the more recent (1990-1995) mean emergence date of May 31. The difference of 21 days enabled the WSS to utilize winter wheat by synchronizing with elongation (Zadoks 31) through anthesis (Zadoks 69), susceptible developmental stages of winter wheat. Recently, the WSS has been able to utilize and cause more damage to winter wheat than to spring wheat in some areas (Morrill and Kushnak 1996).

The increased planting of susceptible wheat lines with more desired agronomic characteristics and higher yields has resulted in an increase or resurgence of the WSS in Montana and North Dakota (Byers and May 1991). Western North Dakota reported an average cutting of 5.2 to 11% and 50 to 90% for 1986 and 1992 respectively (McBride 1987, 1992). A survey of economic losses in spring and winter wheat was conducted in 1995 and 1996 in Montana. Results of the survey reported loss estimates of 15 million bushel at a cost of \$25-30 million per year due to sawfly cutting (Blodgett 1996).

### Canada

Between 1907 and 1922, Criddle studied the life habits, life cycle synchronization of the WSS with its host plants, observed alternative host adaptation to cultivated crops and recommended methods of control. Criddle observed the movement of the WSS from the grass hosts to cultivated wheat and rye in 1907 (Criddle 1911, Bird 1961). He also observed that oviposition was a function of stem diameter which in turn is dependent on

soil moisture and noted that sunshine and warm temperatures were important for oviposition and activity of the WSS (Criddle 1915, Bird 1961). Criddle also recorded preferred grass hosts (*Agropyron* sp., *Elymus* sp., *Calamagrostis* sp., *Deschampsia* sp., *Hordeum jubatum*, *Bromus inermis*), susceptible cultivated crops (hard spring wheat, winter wheat, spring rye, spelt), and resistant cultivated crops (durum, barley, fall rye, oats) for Canadian districts (Criddle 1915, 1922, Bird 1961).

In 1926, Saskatchewan, Canada suffered severe economic losses estimated at \$12 million attributed to WSS infestation. Between 1938 and 1948 grain losses ranged from 560,000 to 700,000 tons in Canada (Farstad et al. 1945, Platt and Farstad 1946). In 1929, at Dominion Experiment Station, Swift Current, it was observed that solid and semi-solid wheat was not seriously damaged by WSS. The solid stemmed wheat had limited feeding on the pith tissue resulting in limited damage from the WSS (Kemp 1934). It was believed that a solid stem offered a possible means of controlling the WSS and a cooperative breeding program was implemented, in 1932, to develop solid stemmed resistant varieties of spring wheat at Dominion Experiment Station, Swift Current and Dominion Entomological Laboratory, Lethbridge, Canada (Platt and Farstad 1946). This research resulted in two solid stemmed WSS resistant varieties 'Rescue' and 'Chinook' in 1938. Rescue was produced from a cross between solid stemmed variety from Portugal 'S-615' (*Triticum vulgare*) and 'Apex' a hollow stemmed spring wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) and Chinook resulted from a cross between a hollow stemmed spring wheat 'Thatcher' and the solid stemmed Portugal wheat 'S-615' (Taylor 1976). Rescue was released in 1946 and over 405,000 hectares were seeded in 1948 (Platt et al. 1948),

however damage from WSS continued to remain high. Rescue and solid stemmed varieties of *T. vulgare* exhibited variability in the degree of sawfly resistance. Platt (1941) and Holmes (1984) determined environmental factors, such as light intensity and duration during stem development (Zadoks 32-45) influenced the expression of the solid stem characteristic therefore resulting in variable resistance from year to year.

In 1952, a second solid stemmed resistant spring wheat variety Chinook was released. In 1954 a combination of factors including weather conditions favorable for wheat stem rust, high parasitism in 1956 and the extensive use of resistant solid stemmed wheat varieties resulted in a decline of WSS populations from 1955 and 1959 (Holmes 1982). WSS populations have remained low in Canada for about 30 years possibly due to a variety of factors including the extensive cultural practice of early swathing to dry grain in preparation for harvest (Byers and May 1991).

#### Wheat Stem Sawfly Management

The conventional wheat crop-fallow system was developed by a farmer in Canada about 1885, and became an established cropping system practice in the northern Great Plains (Howard 1959). Soil moisture was allowed to accumulate for the next growing season in the fallow area left idle from crop or vegetation for one growing season, providing adequate moisture for plant growth with later senescence and increased wheat yields (Black 1983). However, fallow acres contained stubble from the previous year served as a source of overwintering WSS for infestation of adjacent wheat strips.

The extensive use of crop-fallow systems resulted in an increase in soil erosion due to wind and water. To decrease the damaging effects of wind erosion, fields were cultivated in narrow alternating strips of crop and fallow arranged perpendicular to the prevailing wind (Howard 1959). The crop-fallow system of farming amplified sawfly populations by alternating strips suitable for larval overwintering sites (stubble) with wheat host. Current minimum tillage farming practices which replaces soil tillage with chemical weed control (chem.-fallow), decreases tillage and favors WSS survival by reducing larval mortality due to tillage (Holmes and Farstad 1956, Weiss et al. 1987, Weiss and Morrill 1992). A recent study (Runyon et al. 2002) observed that minimum tillage practices should not increase WSS damage but increase in WSS parasitism overtime.

The difficulty in identifying economic and effective means of control spurred research on WSS management. A search for methods of controlling the WSS began in the early 1900's by Criddle in Canada and Ainslie in the U.S. Many WSS management techniques encompassing cultural, biological, and chemical controls have been evaluated, modified, or abandoned. At present the use of solid stemmed varieties is the only effective management technique recommended for control of WSS.

#### Cultural control

In the 1920's recommendations for control of WSS included burning stubble, mowing ditches and field edge grasses, deep tillage, use of trap strips with certain resistant crops. Other management practices considered were shallow tillage, delayed seeding of wheat, and insecticides. However these recommendations were not widely

adopted because of added costs for equipment, management and lack of consistent effectiveness.

Burning stubble in the autumn or spring to kill the larvae in the cut stem stub was suggested as a means of controlling WSS (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Farstad 1942). It was thought that burning the stubble or grass would create enough heat to damage the overwintering chamber or kill the larvae. In highly infested fields the amount of wheat stubble standing, available to fuel the fire is reduced because cut stems are at ground level. Following a burn, exposed WSS stubs are fire-damaged but not sufficient to be an effective or consistent control (Goosey and Johnson 1998 unpub. data). Even in fields with low infestation and a greater proportion of standing stubble, the resulting fire is quick and hot but not uniform or sustained to cause damage to overwintering larvae in stubs (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Farstad 1942). Criddle (1922) used an additional layer of straw spread on an infested field as added fuel for burning. The ground was reported hot to the touch from the fire but no larval mortality was found in stubs sampled. Cut stubs are well insulated from temperature extremes by the soil attached to the crowns. Larvae have the ability to retreat to the lower end of the cocoon in the stub, further insulation themselves from excessive heat (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Criddle 1922, Farstad 1942). Negative effects of burning were an increased risk of erosion and loss of soil organic matter needed to improve soil characteristics and plant growth.

Mowing grasses near roadways and fields was initially a suggested practice for reducing sawfly larvae in the 1920's. However, this practice was not recommended because grasses are a source for parasitoids of the wheat stem sawfly and mowing would

reduce the sawfly larval populations as well as the beneficial parasitoid populations (Ainslie 1920, Criddle 1922).

From 1917-1940's deep tillage using a moldboard plow was a recommended control practice. The practice of turning the stubble, burying it at least 15.2 cm and packing with a harrow between harvest and spring of the following year impeded the emergence of the sawfly adults. Ainslie (1920) found that stubs buried at a 15.2 cm depth resulted in a 35% reduction of emerging adults but is not a practice recommended for Montana, the Dakotas, and Canada because of the high potential for soil and wind erosion (Ainslie 1920, 1929).

The utilization of trap crops as a sink for sawfly oviposition has been recommended based on the assumption that adults are weak flyers and seldom fly further from the emergence point than is necessary to find a suitable host plant (Farstad 1942). The trap crop was typically a narrow strip the width of a seeder, 3-6 meters, planted between the previously infested field and new crop. The trap crop was then cut for hay between July 10-20 following sawfly oviposition to destroy the eggs and larvae (Criddle 1917, Callenbach and Hansmeier 1944). Planting resistant crops such as oats, barley, and winter rye in the trap strip before planting the susceptible crop was suggested as a means of lessening damage to the susceptible crop (Criddle 1917). The use of susceptible varieties in the trap strip (spring and winter wheat, spring rye, oats, barley, durum wheat, and flax) was also recommended. Modifying planting dates of trap crop by 10 to 14 days before and 2 to 3 days after planting main crop was required for spring wheat and spring rye, respectively (Farstad 1942, Farstad et al. 1945). The drawbacks of this method of

control was expense in time, labor, cost, loss of crop acreage, and lower yields and market prices with use of alternative susceptible or resistant crops (Anonymous 1946, Morrill et al. 2001).

Shallow tillage was conducted shortly after harvest in late summer/early fall (Farstad 1942), or spring using one-way disk or duck-foot cultivators (Holmes and Farstad 1956). The purpose was to bring the crowns of the wheat stubble to the surface, while removing excess insulating soil from crowns, exposing the stubs to extreme environmental conditions. Success of fall tillage was dependent on exposure of stubs to hot and dry weather conditions causing desiccation that resulted in 35 to 60 % control (Callenbach and Hansmeier 1944, Holmes and Farstad 1956). Holmes and Farstad (1956) reported greater than 90% mortality by spring tillage exposing prepupal and early pupal stages by heat and cold conditions. Weiss et al. (1987) concluded that shallow spring tillage decreased sawfly survival but not enough to be economical. Morrill et al. (1993) found that overwinter survival of exposed WSS stubs by shallow fall tillage was 7.3 to 8.0% in 1990-1992. Greatest mortality occurred between April and May. Desiccation was a factor in the mortality increase during this time. The drawback of shallow spring or fall tillage was added time, labor and machinery costs, loss of soil moisture from cultivation, and loss of surface residue due to incorporation and increase potential for soil erosion.

In 1997 a study was conducted combining the use of a rotary harrow following spring shallow tillage applications to expose a greater number of soil-free crowns on the soil surface. Crown exposure was increased by 27.93% to 83.53% during 1997. In 1998

the rotary harrow application had a greater percentage of soil-free crowns (55.4% to 69.4%) compared to plots tilled with shovel and rod (27.9% to 44.77%) (Goosey 1999).

Delaying seeding spring wheat until after May 20<sup>th</sup> in fields expected to have high WSS infestations resulted in immature developmental stages of the wheat therefore avoiding WSS infestation (Farstad 1942, Callenbach and Hansmeier 1944, Farstad et al. 1945). McNeal et al. (1955) found that seeding would have to be delayed until after June 1 to avoid serious sawfly damage, however late seeding would result in yield losses due to a shortened growing season. In 1987, Weiss et al. conducted a study on the influence of planting dates. The results confirmed that planting after May 18 was not economical and resulted in reduced wheat yields.

Goosey (1999) looked at the effect of swathing wheat to minimize WSS larval cutting damage and reduce overwintering populations of the WSS while preventing grain yield and quality losses. Although larval survival was less than 20%, grain test weight decreased and protein increased at grain moisture levels above 40 to 48%. Swathing at crop moisture levels of 40-48% could reduce overwintering larval population. However, the disadvantage is added labor, machinery, and time is needed to incorporate this technique (Goosey 1999).

Insecticides have been examined as a possible control measure since the 1940's. From 1940 to 1960's chemicals have been applied as dusts, sprays, and granular applications, in seed, furrow, broadcast, and foliar treatments. In the 1950's parathion applied as a foliar treatment for control of WSS adults was ineffective and because of its short residual activity did not prevent oviposition due to the extended flight period

(Holmes and Hurtig 1952). Wallace (1962) found seed, broadcast, and furrow chemical treatments with a systemic mode of action did not control adults. Only heptachlor applied as seed and furrow treatments offered some control during the larval development stage. Most of the organochlorine, long residual insecticide chemicals tested such as DDT, dieldrin, heptachlor, and aldrin are now banned from use in the U.S. due primarily to environmental persistence and non-target effects. Few chemicals offer the residual activity needed to control WSS eggs and larvae, however, insecticides with new modes of action or range of activities are continually tested, as they become available.

#### Biological control

There are nine established parasitoids that have been recorded to attack *C. cinctus* in resident and native grasses in the northern Great Plains. They are: *Bracon cephi* (Gahan), *Bracon lissogaster* Muesebeck, *Eupelmella vesicularis* (Retzuis), *Eupelmus allynii* (French), *Eurytoma atripes* Gahan, *Pediobius utahensis* (Crawford), *Pediobius nigritarsis* (Thomson), and *Scambus detritus* (Holmgren), and *Eurytoma parva* Phillips (Holmes 1953, Holmes et al. 1963, Davis et al. 1955, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Morrill 1997). Only *Bracon cephi* and *Bracon lissogaster* have been successful in parasitizing WSS in wheat hosts (Morrill et al. 1998, Runyon et al. 2001).

*Bracon cephi* and *B. lissogaster* are both specialists on *C. cinctus*. *Bracon cephi* has been instrumental in reducing WSS populations in areas of Canada (Nelson and Farstad 1953, Holmes et al. 1963) and Montana. Morrill et al. (1994, 1998) reported levels of parasitism in Pondera County, Montana averaging 70-79% in 1992-93 and 15-98% between 1994 -1997.

*Pediobius utahensis* is a generalist native to North America with two known hosts (Ivie 2001). *Pediobius utahensis* has a wide geographic range, parasitizing WSS in grass hosts and was reported parasitizing WSS wheat in Utah in 1918 (Gahan 1921) and 1948 in North Dakota (Munro et al. 1949). *Eupelmus allynii* and *E. vesicularis* are both generalists with over thirty hosts, including *B. cephi* (Nelson 1953, Wallace and McNeal 1966, Ivie 2001). *Pediobius nigritarsis* and *E. atripes* are both generalist parasitoids that use the Hessian fly (*Mayetiola destructor*) as their primary host (Wallace and McNeal 1966, Ivie 2001). *Scambus detritus* is a generalist that was identified in Montana as a parasitoid of *C. cinctus* in 1952 (Holmes 1953) but is a parasitoid of *C. pygmaeus* in Europe (Salt 1931). *Eurytoma parva* is a primary parasitoid of the wheat joint worm (*Harmolita tritici*) but also attacks *C. cinctus*.

*Collyria calcitrator* (Gravenhorst) and *Bracon terebella* Wesmael both parasitoids of *C. pygmaeus* were introduced for possible control of *C. cinctus* in Montana, North Dakota and Canada. *Collyria calcitrator* was released in the Prairie Provinces in Canada from 1930-39 (Smith 1959), in North Dakota and Montana from 1952-55 (Davis et al. 1955, Davis 1959), in Alberta Canada in 1960 (Smith 1961). *Bracon terebella* was released from 1952-55 in North Dakota and Montana (Davis et al. 1955, 1957). Both parasitoids were unsuccessful in establishing in the Northern Great Plains on WSS. In 1937, *Heterospilus cephi* Rohwer a parasitoid of *C. pygmaeus* was released in Canada but was unsuccessful in establishing (Clausen 1977).

### Host Plant Resistance

In 1932 a breeding program was implemented at Swift Current, Canada to develop resistant varieties of spring wheat to WSS (Taylor 1976). This research resulted in two solid stemmed varieties 'Rescue' and 'Chinook' in 1938. Rescue was produced from a cross between solid stemmed variety from Portugal 'S-615' and 'Apex' a hollow stemmed spring wheat (Platt and Farstad 1953) and Chinook resulted from a cross between a hollow stemmed spring wheat 'Thatcher' and the solid stemmed Portugal wheat 'S-615' (Taylor 1976). Rescue successfully reduced sawfly infestation to less than 1% in some areas. Agronomically, Rescue was not adapted to a wide growing area and exhibited average yield potential and low baking quality (Stoa 1947, Platt and Farstad 1953). In 1952 the solid stemmed resistant variety Chinook was released. Cypress, a cross between two solid stemmed wheat varieties Rescue and Chinook, was released in 1962 (Taylor 1976).

United States wheat breeding programs have resulted in additional solid stemmed spring wheat cultivars adapted to a wider area. 'Fortuna' a solid stemmed spring wheat was developed and released from North Dakota Agricultural Experiment Station in 1966 and was adapted to eastern Montana dryland districts. Fortuna was the first solid stemmed variety to combine resistance of leaf and stem rust with sawfly resistance. Fortuna was developed by crossing 'Rescue-Chinook' / 'Frontana' // 'Kenya 58-Newthatch'. The source of sawfly resistance is from Rescue and Chinook. Fortuna was superior in flour quality, yield and protein to previous solid stemmed varieties (Lebsock et al. 1967).

'Lew', a solid stem spring wheat variety was released in 1977 with resistant to stripe rust, leaf rust, and stem rust and had superior milling and baking qualities (McNeal and Berg 1977). Lew was selected from the cross of 'Fortuna' / 'S6285'. S6285 is a hollow stemmed selection with Rescue and Chinook in its pedigree.

The MSU Winter Wheat Breeding Program has recently released two resistant solid stemmed, hard red winter wheat cultivars 'Vanguard' and 'Rampart'. Vanguard was released as a sawfly resistant cultivar in 1995 as an emergency measure to reduce losses by the WSS. Vanguard is a cross of 'Lew' / 'Tiber' // 'Redwin' (Carlson et al. 1997). Rampart was released in 1996 and is a sister line to Vanguard sharing the same parentage (Bruckner et al. 1997). Lew is the source of solid stemmed resistant characteristics for both cultivars. Although Vanguard and Rampart yield lower than hollow stemmed cultivars in the absence of WSS they are equivalent or superior to most hollow stemmed varieties under heavy sawfly pressure. Both Rampart and Vanguard meet domestic quality standards for high quality bread flour and protein content (Carlson et al. 1997, Bruckner et al. 1997).

Acceptance of solid stemmed WSS cultivars by producers has been slow due to less favorable agronomic characteristics such as variable expression of the resistant character stem solidness resulting in inconsistent WSS protection. Other less favorable characteristics include reduced disease resistance, and with some cultivars lower protein content and lower yield compared to hollow stemmed WSS susceptible varieties. Producers in northeastern Montana and northwestern North Dakota, to improve yield and

reduce WSS damage, have in the past used resistant and susceptible spring wheat cultivar blends as a management practice (Weiss et al. 1999).

Cultivar mixtures or blends are frequently used in the United States and numerous other countries to control disease and pathogens with some success. A wheat cultivar mixture to study the effect on control of spot blotch (*Bipolaris sorokiniana*) and yield was conducted at Nepal, Mexico from 1990-1993 (Sharma and Dubin 1996). The mixtures reduced spot blotch development and increased yields compared to single cultivars. In California, USA 1991-1993, diverse spring wheat cultivar blends of high and low susceptibility were used to control septoria tritici blotch and leaf rust (Jackson and Wennig 1997). During high to moderate disease pressure blends had less leaf rust and septoria tritici blotch than the high susceptible cultivar. Yield and grain qualities were equivalent or better than single cultivars. Other successful cultivar mixtures or blends have been reported (Castro 2001) including the German Democratic Republic from 1984-1990, disease control in barley production (Wolfe 1997) and China, using susceptible and resistant rice cultivars to control rice blast severity (Zhu et al. 2000). In Switzerland 1992, cultivar mixtures were used as an alternative to fungicides, insecticides and growth regulators use for disease suppression in cereal crops (Mertz and Valenghi 1997). In 1997, Denmark successfully marketed winter barley mixtures with powdery mildew resistance (Munck 1997). Poland has used barley cultivar mixtures for disease suppression since the early 1990's (Gacek 1997) and in Kansas, wheat variety blends occupied 7% of fields in 2000 to stabilize yields, another advantage of blends (Bowden et al. 2001).

Wheat cultivar mixtures or blends have been used to control insects with mixed results. In 1991, Greenbug (*Schizaphis graminum*) biotype C and E resistant and susceptible wheat cultivars blends resulted in a recommendation of 75 resistant/ 25 susceptible ratio for management of both greenbug biotypes (Bush et al. 1991). A study was conducted from 1990-1992 (Sij et al. 1999) with seven arthropod insects on soybean (*Glycine max*). The results indicated that blending insect resistant and susceptible cultivars was not an alternative management tool in soybean. Blends have been demonstrated in some systems to provide benefit to producers in yield and quality while providing protection from insect and disease problems, however, benefits are specific for sites, cultivar use and pest situations.

## CHAPTER 2

## INTRODUCTION

The first North American observation of *Cephus cinctus* Norton, wheat stem sawfly (WSS), was reported as a note at the beginning of 1890 as a WSS infestation of native and resident grasses in Montana, Nevada, and California (Riley and Marlatt, 1891). Riley and Marlatt suggested that wheat stem sawfly might be a potential agricultural pest in cereal grains. With the introduction and expansion of cereal grain cultivation into the intermountain west wheat represented a suitable, abundant alternative host for the WSS. By 1920, the distribution area of *C. cinctus* had expanded north into neighboring provinces of Canada, east to the Mississippi River, south to the 36° parallel and west to the Pacific Ocean (Ainslie 1920, 1929, Davis 1955).

The WSS has historically been successful in shifting from non-cultivated grass hosts to spring wheat (Ainslie 1920, 1929). More recently, with the shift to winter wheat, WSS has become of concern to winter wheat producers in, Canada, Montana, North Dakota, northern Wyoming and northern South Dakota. Economic damage has been recorded in Montana and North Dakota (Davis 1955, Morrill 1985, Blodgett 1996). In the traditional winter wheat belt of the northern Great Plains (southern Wyoming, South Dakota) WSS had been less successful in shifting and infesting winter wheat possibly due to host/insect synchronization.

The wheat stem sawfly, has become a major recurring wheat pest in Montana and the northern Great Plains causing loss of quality and yield. Larvae feeding within the

stem can cause 10.8-22.3% in yield loss and 0.6-1.2% protein reduction in the grain (Holmes 1977). Additionally, larval cutting following feeding causes stem breakage and loss of grain heads prior to harvest. Montana producers have estimated direct grain yield losses at \$25-30 million per year due to sawfly cutting (Blodgett 1996). These losses do not include an increase in custom harvest cost, equipment damage and modifications resulting from WSS infestation.

A search for methods of controlling the WSS began in the early 1900's in Canada and United States. A breeding program was implemented in Canada in 1932 to develop WSS resistant spring wheat varieties (Platt and Farstad 1946). This research resulted in the development of two solid stemmed spring wheat varieties 'Rescue' and 'Chinook' in 1938 (Stoa 1947, Taylor 1976). Rescue was successful in reducing sawfly infestation to less than 1% in some areas but was not widely adapted because it had low baking quality, and only average yield potential (Platt and Farstad 1953). United States wheat breeding programs have subsequently resulted in additional solid stemmed spring wheat cultivars such as 'Fortuna' (Lebsock et al. 1967) and 'Lew' (McNeal and Berg 1977), developed with 'Rescue' and 'Chinook' pedigree and most recently, 'Ernest'. These varieties were adapted to a wider growing area, superior in milling and baking quality and had improved yield and protein over previously developed solid stemmed varieties. In addition to plant breeding for WSS resistance cultural, biological, and chemical controls have been tested, evaluated, modified, or abandoned. These methods have provided inconsistent control and therefore, have not been widely adopted.

The winter wheat breeding program at Montana State University has recently released two WSS resistant solid stemmed hard red winter wheat, 'Vanguard' in 1995 and 'Rampart' in 1996. Although Vanguard and Rampart yield lower than hollow stemmed cultivars in the absence of WSS they are equivalent or superior to most hollow stemmed varieties under heavy sawfly pressure. Both Rampart and Vanguard meet domestic quality standards for high quality bread flour and protein content (Carlson et al. 1997, Bruckner et al. 1997).

Acceptance of solid stemmed, WSS cultivars by producers has been slow due to less favorable agronomic characteristics such as variable expression of the resistant characteristic stem solidness, reduced disease resistance, and with some cultivars lower protein content and lower yield compared to hollow stem WSS susceptible varieties. Variability in the expression of stem solidness results in inconsistent WSS protection. The use of resistant and susceptible spring wheat cultivars blends has been used over the years by producers in northeastern Montana and northwestern North Dakota to improve yields and reduce WSS damage (Weiss et al. 1999).

Cereal variety mixtures or blends are frequently used in the United States and Europe. Blending generally stabilizes yield and quality, reduces management inputs for control of pathogens and disease, and manipulates spatially the density of susceptible hosts and the barrier effect of resistant hosts (Newton and Swanston 1998, Habernicht and Blake 1999).

A recent study in the northern Great Plains blended WSS resistant solid stem and susceptible hollow stem spring wheat cultivars over a 3 year period from 1986 to 1988

(Weiss et al. 1990). The study objectives were to determine if cultivar blends were superior or equal to plantings of single cultivars for use in managing WSS. Wheat stem sawfly damage by cutting was inconsistent with the blends used. The differences between the blends and monocultures were not significant. The study suggested that delaying planting of resistant and susceptible blends would be effective by interrupting the synchronization of plant development and the WSS life cycle. It is also suggested that using the resistant and susceptible blends would be more advantageous when WSS population were low to moderate (Weiss et al. 1990).

The objectives for this project were to determine if blending resistant and susceptible winter wheat influenced WSS infestation, grain yield and protein and oviposition preference in relation to the resistant/susceptible blends.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

### Site Descriptions and Locations

The four sites, Big Sandy, Loma, Broadview and Molt were located in areas with a history of moderate to high infestation levels of wheat stem sawfly (WSS) on privately owned and operated dryland wheat farms using conventional wheat fallow rotation systems. The Big Sandy site, used in both 1997 and 1998, was located in Chouteau County 20.9km west of Big Sandy, Montana (latitude: 48.225°N, longitude: 110.375°W). The elevation was 853m; soil texture was primarily sandy clay loam and an average soil pH of 7.1. The 1997 Broadview site was located in Stillwater County 10.5km west and 12.9km south of Broadview, Montana (latitude: 46.025°N, longitude: -109.025°W). The elevation was 1280m; soil texture was primarily loam/silt loam and an average soil pH of 7.3. The 1998 Loma site was located in Chouteau County 11.3 km south and 24.1 km west of Big Sandy, Montana (latitude: 48.075°N, longitude: 110.475°W). The elevation was 914m; soil texture was primarily clay loam and an average soil pH of 7.1. The 1998 Molt site was located in Stillwater County 1.6 km south of Molt, Montana (latitude: 45.875°N, longitude: 108.925°W). The elevation was 1158m; soil texture was primarily loam/silt loam and an average soil pH of 7.3.

### Wheat Cultivar Selection for Experimental Blends

The winter wheat variety 'Rampart' was selected for its solid stem characteristic, which provides resistance to WSS damage, and yield improvement compared to an earlier released winter wheat solid stem variety 'Vanguard'. The selection criteria for the hollow stemmed (susceptible) cultivar were based on four specific desirable agronomic characteristics: plant maturity, milling and baking qualities, chaff color, and yield.

#### Plant Maturity

Early and late plant maturity differences were important in selecting two hollow stemmed varieties with respect to the medium maturing solid stemmed Rampart and WSS emergence. Plant maturity was based on comparative head emergence dates of the three wheat varieties in June. Wheat stem sawfly emergence occurs from late May until early July, coinciding with the beginning of wheat stem elongation through anthesis. Theoretically, selecting an early maturing hollow stemmed variety could avoid egg deposition by developing early and completing anthesis prior to the peak WSS flight. A medium maturing solid stemmed variety (Rampart) would be selected by WSS because the susceptible developmental plant growth stages coincide with female WSS flight and egg lay. A late maturing hollow stemmed variety could avoid egg deposition by developing late and completing susceptible growth stages after the peak WSS flight.

### Milling and Baking Qualities

The selection of hollow stemmed (susceptible) varieties with equal to or better milling and baking qualities than solid stemmed (resistant) Rampart was essential for selecting blends with the goal of improving grain quality. Milling qualities considered in rating a variety are test weight, kernel hardness, and flour yield. Baking qualities are rated on flour with a high capacity for water absorption, mixing time, and a high loaf volume when baked.

### Chaff Color

Chaff color was selected for the visual identification of the blended varieties in the field. Rampart has brown chaff, therefore selecting a hollow stemmed susceptible variety with white chaff would aid in plant identification and separation when sampling and processing. The chaff color characteristic was especially important when solid stem Rampart did not express stem solidness consistently enough to differentiate between resistant and susceptible varieties. Damage to inner stem tissue due to larval feeding and tunneling also made identification of plant varieties based on stem solidness also difficult without chaff coloration.

### Yield

Choosing high yielding hollow stemmed susceptible varieties were desirable; however susceptible varieties with all four desirable agronomic characteristics, plant maturity differences, milling and baking qualities, chaff color and yield, were limited. A

ten-year comparable average from Havre, MT (Bowman et al., 1996) was used to evaluate and compare yield potential of the hollow and solid stemmed varieties (Table 2).

#### Hollow Stem Cultivar Selection

‘Rocky’ is a hollow stemmed, WSS susceptible, hard red winter wheat variety developed and released as a pure line selection in 1977 by Nickerson American Plant Breeders (now AgriPro Seeds Inc., Slater, Iowa). Rocky has a hollow stem, white chaff, early maturity, medium height, and average milling and baking quality. The winterhardness of Rocky is poor, with a rating of 2 (1=non-hardy, 5=very hardy) (Bowman et al. 1996) (Table 1). Rocky has a high comparable yield average (Bowman et al. 1996) (Table 2).

‘Norstar’ is a hollow stemmed, WSS susceptible, hard red winter wheat variety developed at the Agriculture Canada Research Station, Lethbridge, Alberta and released in 1977. Norstar was selected from a cross of ‘Winalta’/‘Alabaskaya’. Norstar has a hollow stem, white chaff, late maturity, tall height, and very good milling and baking quality. The straw is weak and has a tendency to lodge, typical of tall varieties but is very winter hardy, with a rating of 5 (1=non-hardy, 5=very hardy) (Table 1). Norstar has a low to moderate comparable yield average (Bowman et al. 1996) (Table 2).

#### Solid Stem Cultivar Selection

Rampart is a solid stemmed, hard red winter wheat variety developed at MSU and released for planting, fall 1996. Rampart is a cross of ‘Lew’/‘Tiber’// ‘Redwin’ that was made in 1985. In 1990, an F<sub>5</sub> generation was selected from that cross and tested

successfully for wheat stem sawfly resistance and was released to certified seed producers in 1996. Rampart has a solid stem, brown chaff, medium maturity, medium height, and of excellent milling and baking qualities. The winterhardness of Rampart is poor, with a rating 2 (1= non-hardy, 5= very hardy) (Bowman et al. 1996) (Table 1). Rampart has a moderate comparable yield average (Bowman et al. 1996) (Table 2).

Table 1. Agronomic and quality characteristics of selected hollow and solid stemmed winter wheat cultivars.

Variety	Stem	Maturity <sup>1</sup> Date	Milling/ Baking <sup>2</sup>	Chaff Color	Plant Height	Winter Survival <sup>3</sup>
Rampart	Solid (R)	Medium	4/4	Brown	Medium	2
Rocky	Hollow (S)	Early	3/3	White	Medium	2
Norstar	Hollow (S)	Late	4/4	White	Tall	5

<sup>1</sup> Maturity date is based on relative heading date in June.

<sup>2</sup> Milling and baking qualities are based on a scale of 1-5, 1=Inferior and 5=Superior.

<sup>3</sup> Winter survival is based on a scale of 1-5, 1=non-hardy and 5=very hardy.

Table 2. Yield comparisons between selected hollow and solid stemmed cultivars from Havre, Montana.

Variety	Stem	3 Year Average <sup>1</sup> 1994- 1996		10 Year Comparable Average <sup>2</sup>	
		Test Weight kg/m <sup>3</sup>	Yield kg/ha	Test Weight kg/m <sup>3</sup>	Yield kg/ha
Rampart	Solid stem (R)	795.5	57.5	754.3	45.4
Rocky	Hollow stem (S)	801.9	67.3	767.2	54.8
Norstar	Hollow stem (S)	800.6	58.1	764.6	44.7

<sup>1</sup> The "average yield" for any variety is the total production divided by the number of years.

<sup>2</sup> Comparable yield is calculated by using a "check" variety and by establishing an "average check yield" for a 10-year period.

### Plot Design

Plots were arranged in a randomized complete block design with three replications of five blend treatments, 100/0, 75/25, 50/50, 25/75, and 0/100 of Rocky/Rampart (susceptible/resistant). Individual plots measured 2.4m X 3.7m at Broadview and Molt and 1.8m X 6.1m at Big Sandy and Loma. A 6-row MSU-cone plot seeder set at 30.5 cm row spacing was used at Big Sandy and Loma sites and a 4-row cone plot seeder set at 30.5 cm row spacing was used at Broadview and Molt sites.

### Seeding Preparation

Soil core samples to a depth of 122 cm were collected pre-plant, midseason, and post-harvest at Big Sandy and Loma. Samples were submitted to Montana State University Soil Lab for fertility recommendations. Soil core samples were not collected for fertility recommendations at Broadview and Molt sites. In fall 1996 and 1997 at Big Sandy and fall 1997 at Loma, fertilizer ( $\text{NH}_3 + 11-52-0$ ) was applied pre-planting and Bronate® herbicide was applied at a rate of 1.68 kg/ha to control broadleaf weeds. Fertilization and weed control followed cooperators standard operating practices for Broadview and Molt sites. The seeding rate was 67.2 kg/ha, calculated as 0.6 grams of seed per 30.5cm at all the sites.

### Sampling Methods

WSS adults were swept weekly at each site throughout the flight period using a standard 0.3m diameter sweep net. Three samples per site of ten or twenty-five sweeps

per sample were collected, depending on the relative population density of WSS adults. Sweep samples provided a record of adult numbers, and peak and duration of infestation at each site.

Plant samples were collected weekly beginning in late May or early June through the duration of the WSS adult flight and biweekly thereafter until harvest. Stem samples for each of the Rocky/Rampart, blend treatments (100 % Rocky, 75 Rocky/25 Rampart, 50 Rocky/50 Rampart, 25 Rocky/75 Rampart, 100% Rampart) were collected on 6 sample dates in 1997 at Big Sandy and Broadview, Montana. In 1998, 5 sample dates were collected at Big Sandy and 8 sample dates collected for Loma and Molt, Montana. Plants were gathered by pulling or digging all plants in a 0.17m row, placed into resealable plastic bags or #66 brown paper bags for transportation and storage until processed. Samples from the field were stored in a cold-wet storage room at about 6.0° C in the Plant Growth Center, MSU or frozen at -17.8°C until processed.

Blend samples were processed in the laboratory by first separating plants by cultivars. Growth stage was rated using Zadoks scale (Zadoks et al. 1974), variety, main versus secondary tillers was designated, and number of tillers per plant were recorded for each plant.

Plant samples were collected immediately before harvest (pre-harvest) and approximately two weeks later (post-harvest). Plant samples were gathered by digging all plants in a 0.17m row from the non-harvested outer rows in each plot. Samples were placed in paper bags for transportation and stored at room temperature until processed.

At processing, plant samples were separated by variety and number of WSS cut (stub) and uncut (standing) stems and total stems were recorded for each plot.

Yield samples were obtained by mechanically harvesting the middle four rows of each plot. The plot harvester was adjusted for a cutting height similar to a commercial combine, to simulate a conventional harvest. Harvested samples were cleaned with a grain shaker and weighed. A 150g sample was removed from each plot and sent to the Cereal Quality Lab at MSU for protein analysis.

The WSS adult flight and plant phenological stages were summarized for each site and year. Number of eggs and larvae were analyzed for each blend treatment within each sampling date. Data were also summarized across blend treatment and were analyzed using sample data for the repeated measures analysis. Step-wise regression was used to predict larval infestation in final sample (approximately July 9). Adult WSS peak numbers, flight duration and detection dates of WSS eggs, and adults were used as predictor variables. A comparison of percent wheat cut for each blend treatments was analyzed using an analysis of variance (ANOVA). Yield and percent protein was analyzed using a general linear model (GLM) in PC-SAS (SAS Institute 2000).

## RESULTS

Blend Analysis for Rocky: RampartBig Sandy, Montana 1997

The number of WSS adults per sweep was generally low at Big Sandy, with a peak number of adults, 1.2 per sweep, occurring on 148 JD (28 May), also the first adult detection date (Figure 1). The last WSS adults were detected on day 169JD (18 June), the adult flight duration was 21 days. Plant stage development for both Rocky and Rampart was similar throughout the growing season with Rocky always somewhat advanced over Rampart (Fig. 1). Wheat stem sawfly flight coincides with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Rocky and Rampart were at or near boot stage (Zadoks 40) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 1) (Appendix A).

Eggs: There were significantly more eggs per 10 stems combined across blends for 162 JD (11 June) compared to all the other sample dates (Table 3). Although the number of WSS eggs per 10 stems was greater in every treatment on 162JD, there were no significant differences among blend treatments on this date. Numbers of eggs dropped to very low levels after 162 JD. There was a tendency for greater number of WSS eggs in the Rampart dominant blend treatments from JD 155-169 (Table 3) (Figure 2A).

Larvae: There was a significant difference between the mean number of larvae per 10 stem across sampling dates combined across blend treatments, with significantly

greater numbers of larvae on JD 155, 162, and 176 compared with JD 148, 169 and 190 (Table 4). In Figure 2B, larval numbers initially increased for all blends between JD 148 and 155. While larval infestation generally decreased from larval peak at JD 155 through 169, larval numbers in the 100% Rocky treatment were consistently elevated during this period. On JD 190, there were significant difference ( $P = 0.04$ , Table 4) among blend treatments, with the 100% stands having significantly greater numbers of larvae/10 stems than the blend treatments (Fig. 2B). All larval numbers decreased by JD 190. On the last sample date JD 190 (9 July), there was approximately one larvae for every five wheat stems (Table 4).

#### Broadview, Montana 1997

Adult wheat stem sawfly flight was first detected on JD 150 (30 May) with last adults detected on JD 179 (28 June), flight duration was approximately 28 days. The number of WSS adults per sweep were relatively low at Broadview, with peak numbers of adults on JD 156 (5 June), at about 2.5 per sweep (Figure 3). Zadoks development for both Rocky and Rampart were similar throughout the growing season with Rocky somewhat advanced over Rampart from boot to anthesis stages. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincided with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Rocky and Rampart were at stem elongation (Zadoks 32) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 3) (Appendix A).

Figure 1. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana, 1997.




Table 3. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana. 1997.

Blend Treatments	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	190 (9 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.0 (0.8)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.4 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	2.8 (0.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.7 (0.2)	1.5 (1.3)	3.7 (1.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.4 (0.5)	5.0 (3.5)	3.8 (2.3)	0.3 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7 (0.8)
100 Rampart	1.0 (1.2)	3.6 (2.9)	5.6 (1.6)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	0.6	2.75	1.1	2.06	0.0 (0.0)	1.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.5 (0.2)A <sup>2</sup>	1.9 (0.8)A	3.6 (0.6)B	0.1 (0.04)A	0.0 (0.0)A	0.1 (0.1)A

Table 4. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana. 1997.


48

Blend Treatments	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	190 (9 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.6 <sup>1</sup> (0.8)	11.2 (3.3)	9.4 (5.6)	10.5 (1.1)	7.0 (1.6)	2.5 (0.5)a
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.8 (1.0)	11.6 (3.5)	4.6 (1.6)	5.7 (4.5)	6.9 (2.5)	2.1 (1.0)ab
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.2 (0.3)	9.7 (2.3)	7.3 (5.3)	3.7 (0.8)	6.8 (2.8)	2.3 (0.7)ab
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	8.9 (1.6)	6.0 (3.1)	4.9 (3.1)	8.9 (3.0)	0.2 (0.1)b
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	7.3 (1.3)	8.2 (6.9)	3.1 (2.8)	6.0 (3.6)	3.7 (1.7)a
F statistic	0.75	0.97	0.27	2.84	0.19	4.02
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.04
Mean Across Blends	0.3 (0.2)A <sup>2</sup>	9.9 (0.9)C	7.1 (1.6)C	5.6 (1.1)B	7.1 (0.9)C	2.2 (0.4)B

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 2. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems (+ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1997.



Eggs: There was a significant greater number of WSS eggs observed across blend treatments on JD 156 (5 June) and 163 (12 June) compared with the other sample dates (Table 5). On JD 156, there were significantly more ( $Pr = 0.01$ ) WSS eggs in the blend treatments 75 Rocky/25 Rampart, 50 Rocky/50 Rampart, and 25 Rocky/75 Rampart compared to the 100 Rocky, 100 Rampart plots. WSS egg deposition decreased dramatically after JD 163 (Table 5, Fig 4A).

Larvae: There was a significant difference between the mean number of WSS larvae per 10 stems across sampling dates with significantly greater numbers on the three late season sampling periods JD 179, 192, and 205 compared with earlier season JD 150, 156 and 163 (Table 6). There were no significant differences among blend treatments for mean number of larvae per 10 stems within any of the sample dates.

Larval numbers increased for all blends between JD 156 and 179 (Figure 4B). On the last sample date, JD 205 (24 July), there was approximately one larva for every 1.5 wheat stems (Table 6, Figure 4B).

#### Big Sandy, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was high at Big Sandy, with peak number of adults and also first occurrence observed on JD 140 (20 May), at about 25.5 per sweep (Figure 5). Last adults were detected on JD 168 (17 June), flight duration was approximately 28 days. Zadoks development for both Rocky and Rampart are similar throughout the growing season with Rocky somewhat advanced over Rampart.

Figure 3. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Broadview, Montana, 1997.




Table 5. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana. 1997.

Blend Treatments	150 (30 My)	156 (5 Jn)	163 (12 Jn)	179 (28 Jn)	192 (11 Jl)	205 (24 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	1.8 (NA)b	10.0 (NA) <sup>2</sup>	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.3 (0.3)	6.6 (1.8)a	13.9 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.3 (0.4)	8.9 (2.5)a	11.7 (4.6)	0.4 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.9 (0.9)	9.5 (4.7)a	5.9 (4.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	2.6 (1.9)b	7.5 (2.5)	0.4 (0.6)	0.9 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	1.0	14.9	0.86	0.28	0.9	0.0
Prob>F	NS	0.01	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.3 (0.2)A <sup>3</sup>	6.2 (1.1)B	9.7 (1.3)B	0.2 (0.1)A	0.2 (0.2)A	0.0 (0.0)A

Table 6. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana. 1997.

52


Blend Treatments	150 (30 My)	156 (5 Jn)	163 (12 Jn)	179 (28 Jn)	192 (11 Jl)	205 (24 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.4 (NA) <sup>2</sup>	7.3 (NA)	5.6 (1.8)	7.5 (1.3)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.8 (1.1)	10.3 (0.6)	7.9 (0.6)	8.3 (1.6)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.8 (0.8)	7.5 (2.0)	7.0 (2.7)	7.4 (0.5)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.3)	9.9 (2.5)	6.2 (0.4)	6.6 (0.1)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.7 (0.5)	6.5 (3.3)	7.3 (2.7)	5.7 (1.1)
F statistic	0.0	0.0	2.84	0.49	0.41	1.80
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>3</sup>	0.0 (0.0)A	1.7 (0.4)A	8.2 (0.9)B	6.8 (0.6)B	7.1 (0.4)B

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Standard error ( $\pm$  SE) is not available for 100 Rocky on Julian dates due to missing data.

<sup>3</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 4. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$ SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Broadview, Montana 1997



Wheat stem sawfly flight coincides with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Rocky was at boot stage (Zadoks 45) and Rampart at later stages of stem elongation (Zadoks 37) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 5) (Appendix A).

Eggs: There was a significant difference ( $Pr < 0.01$ ) among sample dates for the mean number of eggs per 10 stems between JD 147 (27 May), JD 154 and the remaining three sample dates (Table 7). There were no significant differences within sampling dates among blend treatments for mean number of eggs per 10 stems.

Larvae: There was a significant difference in the mean number of larvae per 10 stems among sampling dates. There were greater larvae numbers per 10 stems for JD 168 (17 June) compared to JD 175 (24 June) and 196 (15 July) with JD 147 and 157 intermediate (Table 8). On JD 168, there were significantly ( $Pr = 0.02$ ) greater numbers of larvae in the 100 Rampart treatment compared with 100 Rocky and the other blends. Although the larval infestation in the 100 Rampart treatment had increased dramatically on JD 168, larval numbers had decreased and were not different from other blend treatments in the remaining sampling dates (Table 8, Fig. 6B). On the last sample date JD 196 (15 July) there was approximately one larva for every wheat stem.

#### Loma, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was moderate at Loma, with peak number of adults on JD 154 (3 June), at about 5.1 per sweep (Figure 7). Adult flight was first

Figure 5. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana, 1998.




Table 7. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	147 (27 My)	154 (3 Jn)	168 (17 Jn)	175 (24 Jn)	196 (15 Jl)
100 Rocky	59.0 <sup>1</sup> (21.1)	33.8 (18.3)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	56.8 (25.1)	14.9 (4.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	64.6 (6.5)	23.0 (13.1)	1.4 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	38.8 (9.7)	25.2 (6.7)	1.7 (1.3)	1.4 (1.4)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	54.9 (10.3)	14.6 (8.5)	3.9 (3.3)	1.3 (1.6)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	0.70	0.64	1.94	1.00	0.0
Prob> F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	54.8 (5.5) <sup>C</sup> <sup>2</sup>	22.2 (4.0)B	1.4 (0.6)A	0.5 (0.3)A	0.0 (0.0)A


Table 8. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	147 (27 My)	154 (3 Jn)	168 (17 Jn)	175 (24 Jn)	196 (15 Jl)
100 Rocky	13.6 <sup>1</sup> (2.2)	16.7 (7.5)	11.3 (1.6)b	12.0 (2.3)	8.8 (3.3)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	14.2 (3.9)	7.9 (0.7)	19.6 (7.4)b	11.0 (0.3)	10.4 (1.3)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	16.7 (5.0)	21.2 (6.9)	16.7 (2.3)b	10.3 (3.3)	11.2 (1.6)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	15.6 (7.5)	15.3 (4.6)	9.8 (2.8)b	13.3 (1.6)	12.4 (2.5)
100 Rampart	15.0 (6.9)	12.9 (3.3)	40.0 (13.2)a	12.1 (2.1)	12.4 (2.5)
F statistic	0.06	2.58	5.45	0.27	0.52
Prob> F	NS	NS	0.02	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	15.0 (1.7)AB <sup>2</sup>	14.8 (2.0)AB	19.5 (3.6)B	11.6 (0.7)A	11.0 (0.8)A

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 6. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1998.



detected on JD 140 (20 May) with last adults detected on JD 175 (24 June), flight duration was approximately 35 days. Developmental stage of Rocky (Zadoks score) was always advanced compared to Rampart throughout the growing season with differences more pronounced at this site compared with other sites and years. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincided with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Rocky was at later stages of stem elongation (Zadoks 38) compared with Rampart (Zadoks 34) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 7, Appendix A).

Eggs: There were significant differences ( $Pr < 0.01$ ) in numbers of eggs per 10 stems across sampling dates, with JD 161 having more eggs on average than later sampling dates and the first sample, JD 140 (Table 9). Egg number on JD 147 and 154 were intermediate to numbers detected on JD 161 and 168. There was a significant difference among treatments on JD 175 ( $Pr < 0.01$ ) with greater numbers of eggs detected in 100 Rampart treatment compared with the 100 Rocky and other blend treatments (Figure 8A). There was a great deal of variability in egg deposition among the blend treatments but there tended to be more egg lay in the Rampart and Rampart dominated blends which may have been due to slower plant development compared to Rocky.

Larvae: There were significant differences in numbers of larvae per 10 stems across sampling dates, with JD 168 and 195 having more larvae on average than early sample dates JD140, 147, and 154, with JD 175 and 182 intermediate (Table 10).

Larval numbers initially increased for all blends between JD 140 and 168 (Figure 8B). While larval infestation slightly decreased from larval peak at JD 168 through 195, larval numbers remain at or near one larva per stem for all blends with approximately one larva for every wheat stem at the final sample date JD 195 (14 July), (Figure 8B).

#### Molt, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was low at Molt, with peak number of adults on JD 155 (4 June), at about 2.50 per sweep (Figure 9). Adult flight was first detected on JD 141 (21 May) with last adults detected on JD 176 (25 June), flight duration was approximately 35 days. Zadoks development for both Rocky and Rampart were similar throughout the growing season with Rocky always somewhat advanced over Rampart. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincided with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Rocky was at later stages of stem elongation (Zadoks 37) and Rampart was at stem elongation (Zadoks 35) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 9, Appendix A).

Eggs: There was a significant difference between the mean number of eggs per 10 stems across sampling dates with greater numbers of eggs on average detected on JD 155 (4 June) compared with all other sample dates (Table 11). There was no significant difference among number of WSS eggs per 10 stems within sampling dates for all sample dates. There is a slight increase in numbers of eggs deposited in the Rampart plots on JD 176 (Fig 10B) similar to the pattern observed at Loma (Fig 8).

Figure 7. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Loma, Montana, 1998.




Table 9. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	140 (20My)	147 (27My)	154 (13Jn)	161 (10Jn)	168 (17Jn)	175 (24Jn)	182 (1Jl)	195 (14Jl)
100 Rocky	1.1 <sup>1</sup> (1.1)	7.4 (5.9)	6.1 (4.1)	2.9 (1.5)	0.9 (1.1)	0.4 (0.2)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.9 (0.9)	4.3 (2.2)	3.2 (2.5)	1.4 (0.6)	1.1 (0.2)	0.3 (0.2)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	1.3 (0.7)	4.4 (1.6)	6.0 (2.1)	7.3 (1.2)	2.8 (0.9)	0.2 (0.2)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.2 (0.2)	8.8 (2.3)	4.7 (2.6)	6.8 (1.6)	0.6 (0.4)	0.3 (0.3)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	1.4 (1.0)	2.6 (3.2)	9.1 (5.6)	2.6 (1.6)	4.4 (1.5)a	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	2.1	1.08	0.52	1.21	1.62	9.85	0.0	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	<0.01	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.7 (0.3)A <sup>2</sup>	5.3 (1.2)BC	4.5 (1.2)BC	5.5 (1.3)C	1.6 (0.4)AB	1.1 (0.5)A	0.0 (0.0)A	0.0 (0.0)A


Table 10. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	140 (20My)	147 (27My)	154 (13Jn)	161 (10Jn)	168 (17Jn)	175 (24Jn)	182 (1Jl)	195 (14Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.4 (0.6)	3.3 (1.1)	8.7 (4.2)	7.3 (2.9)	7.3 (1.2)	8.5 (1.3)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.1)	1.5 (0.6)	4.7 (2.4)	7.9 (1.1)	8.5 (1.2)	9.3 (0.9)	10.2 (0.3)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.7 (1.3)	7.2 (1.9)	10.8 (1.0)	9.9 (0.8)	9.8 (0.2)	9.2 (0.7)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.2)	3.8 (0.4)	10.1 (2.5)	12.9 (1.6)	9.5 (4.8)	11.3 (1.3)	11.0 (0.8)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.3 (0.3)	10.0 (3.9)	11.1 (5.4)	10.1 (3.5)	8.2 (2.2)	10.5 (1.8)
F statistic	0.0	0.68	2.32	2.09	0.61	0.27	1.36	0.94
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>2</sup>	0.1 (0.1)A	2.3 (0.3)B	7.1 (1.1)C	10.3 (1.1)D	9.1 (0.9)CD	9.0 (0.5)CD	9.9 (0.4)D

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 8. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Loma, Montana 1998.



Larvae: There was a significant difference between the mean number of larvae across sampling dates with significantly greater larval numbers detected in the later sampling dates, JD 169, 176, 183 and 199 compared with earlier sampling dates JD 141, 148, 155, and 162 (Table 12). There were no significant differences in the mean number of larvae per 10 stems within sampling dates among blend treatments for all sample dates.

Larval numbers generally increased for all blends between JD 148 and 183 (Figure 10B). On the last sample date JD 199 (18 July) there is approximately one larva for every two wheat stems (Table 12, Figure 10B).

#### Blend Analysis for Norstar: Rampart

##### Big Sandy, Montana 1997

The numbers of WSS adults per sweep were low at Big Sandy, with a peak of 1.2 per sweep, occurring on JD148 (28 May), also the first adult detection date (Figure 11). The last WSS adults were detected on day JD169 (18 June), a flight duration of approximately 21 days. Plant development (Zadoks scale) for both Norstar and Rampart was similar throughout the growing season with Rampart somewhat advanced over Norstar (Figure 11). Wheat stem sawfly flight coincided with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Norstar and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Norstar was at stem elongation (Zadoks 33) and Rampart at a late stage of

Figure 9. Comparison of Rocky: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Molt, Montana, 1998.




Table 11. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	141 (21 My)	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	183 (2 Jl)	199 (18 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	2.8 (1.9)	3.7 (2.1)	0.2 (0.3)	0.2 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.1 (0.1)	3.3 (0.6)	3.3 (2.8)	0.3 (0.4)	1.5 (1.8)	0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	2.6 (1.3)	2.7 (2.0)	1.2 (1.4)	0.6 (0.7)	0.4 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	2.3 (1.3)	4.1 (2.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	1.9 (1.0)	2.3 (0.9)	0.6 (0.4)	0.2 (0.2)	1.5 (0.9)	0.5 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	0.0	0.35	0.99	0.81	0.75	2.09	1.63	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	<0.1 (0.1)A <sup>2</sup>	2.6 (0.4)A	3.2 (0.7)B	0.5 (0.3)A	0.6 (0.3)A	0.4 (0.2)A	0.1 (0.1)A	0.0 (0.0)A


Table 12. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Rocky and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	141 (21 My)	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	183 (2 Jl)	199 (18 Jl)
100 Rocky	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.2)	2.5 (1.8)	4.5 (2.0)	4.9 (1.0)	5.0 (2.1)	5.0 (1.2)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.2)	0.2 (0.2)	2.1 (0.4)	2.1 (0.9)	4.7 (0.3)	7.3 (2.0)	4.1 (0.8)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.9 (0.8)	0.9 (0.5)	5.3 (2.8)	3.4 (0.6)	5.7 (2.6)	6.1 (1.0)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.8 (0.8)	4.1 (1.0)	4.3 (2.3)	6.2 (4.3)	5.1 (2.6)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.6 (1.4)	1.8 (0.6)	3.4 (2.3)	3.9 (0.6)	3.4 (1.0)	6.1 (1.3)
F statistic	0.0	1.0	1.71	1.21	0.52	0.44	1.59	0.44
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>2</sup>	<0.1 (0.1)A	0.6 (0.3)A	1.7 (0.3)A	3.9 (0.6)B	4.2 (0.4)B	5.5 (0.7)B	5.3 (0.5)B

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 10. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends, Molt, Montana 1998.



stem elongation (Zadoks 39) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 11) (Appendix A).

Eggs: Mean egg numbers per 10 stems were greater for JD 155 (4 June) and JD 162 (11 June) compared with all other sampling dates (Table 13). Egg deposition increased dramatically on JD 162 compared to all other sample dates (Fig 12A). There were significantly ( $Pr = 0.04$ ) greater number of eggs in the 50 Norstar/50 Rampart treatment compared with all other blends on JD 169 (18 June).

Larvae: There were significantly more WSS larvae infesting stems on sampling dates, JD 155 (4 June) through JD 176 (25 June) compared to the first and last sample dates (Table 14).

On JD 162, there were significantly more ( $Pr < 0.01$ ) larvae per 10 stems among treatments, with 100% Norstar > 75 Norstar/25 Rampart > 50 Norstar/50 Rampart > 25 Norstar/75 Rampart (Table 14). Number of larvae in the 100% Rampart treatment were similar to the 50 Norstar/50 Rampart and the 25 Norstar/75 Rampart treatments.

There were also differences among blend treatments on JD 176, with significantly ( $Pr = 0.03$ ) greater number of larvae in the 50 Norstar/50 Rampart treatment compared to 75 Norstar/25 Rampart, 25 Norstar/75 Rampart and 100 Rampart treatments with 100 Norstar intermediate (Table 14, Fig 12 B). On the last sample date JD 190 (9 July), there is approximately one larva for every two wheat stems.

Figure 11. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana, 1997.




Table 13. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana. 1997.

Blend Treatments	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	190 (9 Jl)
100 Norstar	1.7 <sup>1</sup> (1.2)	1.7 (1.7)	4.8 (2.7)	0.0 (0.0)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	1.3 (1.3)	0.5 (0.3)	10.2 (3.7)	0.0 (0.0)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	2.1 (1.3)	6.6 (6.3)	7.0 (2.5)	0.2 (0.1)a	0.2 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	2.3 (1.0)	3.1 (1.0)	4.1 (1.7)	0.0 (0.0)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.5 (0.3)	3.3 (2.5)	6.7 (2.5)	0.0 (0.0)b	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	1.69	0.64	2.53	3.95	1.0	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	0.04	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	1.6 (0.4)B <sup>2</sup>	3.3 (1.2)BC	6.5 (1.0)C	0.04 (0.04)AB	0.1 (0.1)AB	0.0 (0.0)A

Table 14. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana. 1997.


69

Blend Treatments	148 (28 My)	155 (4 Jn)	162 (11 Jn)	169 (18 Jn)	176 (25 Jn)	190 (9 Jl)
100 Norstar	0.1 <sup>1</sup> (0.1)	9.0 (1.7)	15.9 (2.5)a	8.8 (4.4)	10.9 (1.7)ab	8.6 (1.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.3 (0.4)	10.6 (2.6)	10.7 (1.3)b	9.6 (2.0)	8.1 (2.1)b	5.9 (0.9)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.3 (0.4)	11.6 (2.3)	8.3 (2.0)c	9.8 (3.3)	14.4 (2.7)a	4.6 (2.3)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.1 (0.1)	11.2 (1.1)	2.3 (0.7)d	4.5 (2.3)	6.7 (2.6)b	5.3 (1.1)
100 Rampart	0.2 (0.3)	9.8 (5.4)	4.8 (1.6)cd	7.0 (3.6)	5.1 (2.1)b	3.3 (2.5)
F statistic	0.15	0.2	13.37	1.62	4.55	2.59
Prob>F	NS	NS	<0.01	NS	0.03	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.2 (0.1)A <sup>2</sup>	10.6 (1.1)C	8.4 (1.4)C	7.9 (1.3)C	9.0 (1.1)C	5.5 (0.7)B

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 12. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1997.



Broadview, Montana 1997

Adult wheat stem sawfly flight was first detected on JD 150 (30 May) with last adults detected on JD 179 (28 June), flight duration approximately 28 days. The number of WSS adults per sweep was relatively low at Broadview, with peak numbers of adults on JD 156 (5 June) of, 2.5 per sweep (Figure 13). Zadoks development for both Norstar and Rampart was similar throughout the growing season with Rampart somewhat advanced over Norstar from boot to milk stages. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincides with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Norstar and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Both Norstar and Rampart were at stem elongation (Zadoks 32) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 13) (Appendix A).

Eggs: There was a significantly greater number of WSS eggs observed across blend treatments on JD 156 (5 June) and 163 (12 June) compared with the other sample dates (Table 15). There were no significant differences among blend treatments for mean number of eggs per 10 stems within any of the sample dates. On JD 192, treatment 25 Norstar/75 Rampart recorded egg deposition when egg deposition in all other treatments had ended, however it was not significantly different (Table 15, Fig 14A).

Larvae: There was a significant difference in the mean number of WSS larvae per 10 stems among sampling dates with significantly greater numbers on the three late season sampling periods JD 179, 192, and 205 compared with earlier season JD 150, 156 and 163 (Table 16). There were no significant differences among blend treatments for mean number of larvae per 10 stems within any of the sample dates. On the last sample

date, JD 205 (24 July), there was approximately one larva for every 1.5 wheat stems (Table 16, Figure 14B).

#### Big Sandy, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was extremely high at Big Sandy, with peak number of adults and also first occurrence observed on JD 140 (20 May), at about 25.5 per sweep (Figure 15). The last adults were detected on JD 168 (17 June), at 0.05 per sweep. Adult flight duration lasted approximately 28 days. Zadoks development for both Norstar and Rampart was similar throughout the growing season with Rampart somewhat advanced over Norstar. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincides with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Rocky and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Norstar and Rampart were at stem elongation (Zadoks 38 and 37, respectively) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 15) (Appendix A).

Eggs: There was a significant difference in the mean number of eggs per 10 stems among sampling dates with greater mean number of eggs per 10 stems for JD 147 (27 May) followed by JD 154, JD 168 and JD 196 (Table 17). There were no significant differences within sampling dates among blend treatments for mean number of eggs per 10 stems (Table 17, Figure 16A).

Figure 13. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Broadview, Montana, 1997.




Table 15. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana. 1997.

Blend Treatments	150 (30 My)	156 (5 Jn)	163 (12 Jn)	179 (28 Jn)	192 (11 Jl)	205 (24 Jl)
100 Norstar	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	5.2 (NA)	11.6 (NA) <sup>2</sup>	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	4.6 (0.3)	8.0 (5.2)	0.2 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	2.7 (2.3)	8.1 (2.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	3.6 (2.0)	10.1 (2.3)	0.0 (0.0)	1.2 (1.4)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	1.2 (0.5)	8.5 (5.2)	0.3 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	0	1.12	0.18	0.85	0.77	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>3</sup>	3.2 (0.6)B	9.0 (1.4)B	0.1 (0.1)A	0.3 (0.3)A	0.0 (0.0)A

Table 16. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 6 sampling dates (Julian Date), Broadview, Montana. 1997.


Blend Treatments	150 (30 My)	156 (5 Jn)	163 (12 Jn)	179 (28 Jn)	192 (11 Jl)	205 (24 Jl)
100 Norstar	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	2.1 (NA) <sup>2</sup>	8.3 (NA)	6.7 (NA)	6.7 (NA)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.3)	2.1 (1.4)	7.4 (1.7)	7.0 (1.1)	5.6 (2.2)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	3.2 (0.9)	5.6 (0.4)	6.7 (1.1)	8.2 (0.5)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.4 (1.0)	7.5 (2.5)	8.7 (4.4)	4.9 (2.2)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.4)	5.3 (0.9)	5.0 (5.0)	5.5 (0.1)
F statistic	0.0	0.64	1.84	1.17	0.26	1.7
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>3</sup>	0.1 (0.1)A	1.7 (0.4)A	6.7 (0.6)B	6.8 (1.1)B	6.1 (0.6)B

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Standard error ( $\pm$  SE) is not available for 100 Norstar across all Julian dates due to missing data.

<sup>3</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 14. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Broadview, Montana 1997.



Larvae: There was a significant difference in the mean number of larvae per 10 stems among sampling dates with greater mean number of larvae per 10 stems detected on JD 168 (17 June) compared to JD 147 (27 May) and 154 (3 June) with JD 175 and 196 intermediate (Table 18). There were no significant differences within sampling dates among blend treatments for mean number of larvae per 10 stems (Table 18, Figure 16B). On the last sample date JD 196 (15 July) there were approximately two larvae for every wheat stem.

#### Loma, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was generally moderate to high at Loma, with peak number of adults on JD 154 (3 June), of 5.1 per sweep (Figure 17). Adult flight was first detected on JD 140 (20 May) with last adults detected on JD 175 (24 June), flight duration approximately 35 days. Zadoks development for both Norstar and Rampart was similar with Rampart slightly behind Norstar throughout the growing season. Differences in growth stage were the reverse of what was observed at other sites and years. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincided with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Norstar and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Norstar and Rampart were at stem elongation (Zadoks 37 and 36, respectively) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 17) (Appendix A).

Figure 15. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Big Sandy, Montana, 1998.




Table 17. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	147 (27 My)	154 (3 Jn)	168 (17 Jn)	175 (24 Jn)	196 (15 Jl)
100 Norstar	78.3 <sup>1</sup> (2.6)	41.2 (24.7)	1.1 (0.7)	1.1 (1.1)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	100.1 (46.7)	37.5 (6.8)	4.4 (1.0)	0.3 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	86.1 (32.2)	33.4 (2.5)	2.8 (2.0)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	61.2 (23.8)	20.7 (4.5)	4.5 (3.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	53.7 (18.1)	11.1 (6.3)	2.6 (1.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F treatment	0.97	1.60	0.97	1.14	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	75.9 (9.9)D <sup>2</sup>	28.8 (4.8)C	3.1 (0.7)B	0.3 (0.2)AB	0.0 (0.0)A

Table 18. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 5 sampling dates (Julian Date), Big Sandy, Montana 1998.


78

Blend Treatment	147 (27 My)	154 (3 Jn)	168 (17 Jn)	175 (24 Jn)	196 (15 Jl)
100 Norstar	12.3 <sup>1</sup> (1.0)	10.3 (3.2)	14.8 (5.5)	11.3 (3.7)	17.1 (7.9)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	8.7 (4.5)	12.8 (2.0)	33.3 (8.7)	16.5 (4.4)	11.9 (0.8)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	11.7 (6.2)	10.9 (5.5)	27.5 (12.2)	16.1 (3.3)	22.8 (2.8)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	3.7 (1.3)	16.4 (4.0)	19.0 (7.3)	22.4 (10.8)	23.5 (4.4)
100 Rampart	6.8 (3.3)	17.6 (5.4)	23.2 (11.2)	24.3 (10.7)	25.7 (6.8)
F statistic	1.54	1.74	0.52	2.01	1.56
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	8.6 (1.4)A <sup>2</sup>	13.6 (1.5)B	23.6 (3.4)C	18.6 (2.6)BC	20.4 (2.0)BC

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 16. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Big Sandy, Montana 1998.



Eggs: There were significant differences in mean numbers of eggs per 10 stems among sampling dates, with JD 147 (27 May), 154 (13 June) and 161 (10 June) having more eggs on average than later sampling dates and the first sample taken on JD 140 (Table 19). There was a significant difference among blend treatments on JD 154 ( $P = 0.02$  with greater numbers of eggs detected in 100 Norstar treatment compared with the 50 Norstar/50 Rampart and 100 Rampart with remaining treatments intermediate (Figure 18A).

Larvae: There was a significant difference in the mean number of WSS larvae per 10 stems among sampling dates with significantly greater numbers on the five late season sampling periods JD 161, 168, 168, 175, 182 and 195 compared with earlier season JD 140, 147 and 154 (Table 20). There were no significant differences within sampling dates among blend treatments for mean number of larvae per 10 stems (Table 20, Figure 18B)

Larval numbers initially increase for all blends between JD 147 and 161 (Figure 18B). On the last sample date JD 195 (14 July) there was approximately one larva for every wheat stem (Table 20, Figure 18B).

### Molt, Montana 1998

The number of WSS adults per sweep was low to moderate at Molt, with peak number of adults detected on JD 155 (4 June), at levels of 2.50 per sweep (Figure 19). Adult flight was first detected on JD 141 (21 May) with last adults detected on JD 176 (25 June), flight duration approximately 35 days. Zadoks development for both Norstar

Figure 17. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Loma, Montana, 1998.




Table 19. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	140 (20My)	147 (27My)	154 (13Jn)	161 (10Jn)	168 (17Jn)	175 (24Jn)	182 (1Jl)	195 (14Jl)
100 Norstar	2.5 <sup>1</sup> (0.4)	8.2 (0.6)	9.4 (2.1)c	2.9 (1.5)	0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.2)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	1.4 (0.7)	6.2 (3.3)	6.4 (1.5)ab	3.7 (1.1)	1.3 (0.9)	0.4 (0.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	2.1 (1.8)	6.5 (0.9)	5.1 (1.0)a	3.9 (2.1)	0.6 (0.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	4.1 (2.5)	7.7 (2.3)ab	6.7 (3.5)	2.9 (2.0)	0.6 (0.7)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.1 (0.1)	4.7 (1.1)	2.7 (1.9)a	5.8 (3.1)	1.1 (1.3)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F treatment	2.11	0.93	5.41	0.66	1.04	1.09	0.0	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	0.02	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	1.2 (0.4)A <sup>2</sup>	5.9 (0.7)B	6.3 (0.8)B	4.6 (0.9)B	1.2 (0.4)A	0.2 (0.1)A	0.0 (0.0)A	0.0 (0.0)A


Table 20. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Loma, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	140 (20My)	147 (27My)	154 (13Jn)	161 (10Jn)	168 (17Jn)	175 (24Jn)	182 (1Jl)	195 (14Jl)
100 Norstar	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	5.1 (2.2)	9.7 (1.5)	8.6 (1.4)	10.0 (2.0)	6.6 (2.1)	9.5 (0.3)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	5.6 (2.0)	9.5 (0.4)	9.0 (1.1)	8.9 (1.0)	5.2 (0.6)	7.9 (1.1)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	3.6 (1.8)	8.8 (4.7)	10.9 (1.1)	7.6 (4.1)	8.2 (0.6)	8.5 (0.9)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.5 (0.9)	9.7 (2.0)	12.0 (4.0)	5.8 (0.8)	11.7 (3.2)	9.8 (1.2)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.1 (0.1)	1.1 (0.9)	6.8 (4.9)	6.8 (7.1)	7.3 (3.8)	4.8 (2.3)	9.7 (3.7)
F treatment	0.0	1.0	2.60	0.36	0.51	0.63	2.42	0.80
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>2</sup>	<0.1 (0.0)A	3.4 (0.7)B	8.9 (1.0)C	9.4 (1.2)C	7.9 (0.9)C	7.3 (0.9)C	9.1 (0.6)C

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 18. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Loma, Montana 1998.



and Rampart are similar throughout the growing season with Rampart always advanced over Norstar throughout the growing season with differences more pronounced at this site compared with other sites and years. Wheat stem sawfly flight coincides with the most susceptible wheat growth stages for Norstar and Rampart (stem elongation through anthesis, Zadoks 31-69, respectively). Norstar and Rampart were at stem elongation (Zadoks 34 and 35, respectively) when adult flight was first detected (Figure 19) (Appendix A).

Eggs: There was a significant difference in the mean number of eggs per 10 stems among sampling dates with greater numbers of eggs detected on JD 148 (28 May) and 155 (4 June) compared with all other sample dates (Table 21, Figure 20A). There were no significant differences among blend treatments for mean number of eggs per 10 stems within any of the sample dates (Table 21).

Larvae: There was a significant difference in the mean number of larvae per 10 stem among sampling dates with significantly greater larval numbers detected in the later sampling dates, JD 176, 183 and 199 compared with earlier sampling dates JD 141, 148, 155, 162 and 169 (Table 22). There was a significant difference among blend treatments JD 176 ( $Pr < 0.01$ ) with greater numbers of larvae detected in 100 Norstar treatment compared with all other blend treatments (Figure 20B). On the last sample date JD 199 (18 July) there was approximately one larva for every two wheat stems (Table 22, Figure 20B).

Figure 19. Comparison of Norstar: Rampart Zadoks growth stages and wheat stem sawfly adult flight at Molt, Montana, 1998.




Table 21. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly eggs per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	141 (21My)	148 (28My)	155 (4Jn)	162 (11Jn)	169 (18Jn)	176 (25Jn)	183 (2Jl)	199 (18Jl)
100 Norstar	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	3.5 (1.7)	6.5 (3.7)	0.3 (0.3)	1.8 (1.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	4.7 (1.3)	2.7 (0.8)	2.3 (2.1)	1.5 (0.6)	1.2 (0.8)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	5.5 (0.4)	4.7 (2.9)	0.9 (1.1)	0.9 (0.6)	0.1 (0.1)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	1.1 (0.6)	2.2 (1.6)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.4)	1.2 (0.5)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	3.9 (2.5)	1.1 (0.1)	0.7 (0.6)	1.4 (0.4)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
F treatment	0.0	3.01	3.05	1.19	0.56	3.43	0.0	0.0
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>2</sup>	3.7 (0.6)C	3.4 (0.9)C	0.8 (0.4)AB	1.2 (0.3)B	0.5 (0.2)AB	0.0 (0.0)A	0.0 (0.0)A


Table 22. Mean number of wheat stem sawfly larvae per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for blends of two winter wheat varieties, (hollow stem) Norstar and (solid stem) Rampart for 8 sampling dates (Julian Date), Molt, Montana 1998.

Blend Treatment	141 (21My)	148 (28My)	155 (4Jn)	162 (11Jn)	169 (18Jn)	176 (25Jn)	183 (2Jl)	199 (18Jl)
100 Norstar	0.0 <sup>1</sup> (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.3)	0.6 (0.4)	6.7 (1.3)	10.9 (1.5)a	8.0 (2.2)	7.6 (1.6)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.3 (0.5)	2.2 (1.3)	3.3 (2.2)	4.3 (1.7)b	6.4 (3.2)	7.2 (0.4)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.5 (0.6)	2.5 (1.3)	3.6 (2.8)	4.8 (1.9)b	6.9 (1.1)	4.2 (1.1)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	1.0 (1.0)	2.8 (0.8)	5.7 (1.8)b	8.5 (2.4)	4.2 (1.4)
100 Rampart	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.2 (0.2)	2.8 (1.5)	1.8 (1.3)	5.6 (0.7)b	8.9 (2.6)	5.8 (0.7)
F treatment	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.20	1.29	5.7	0.32	3.42
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	<0.01	NS	NS
Mean Across Blends	0.0 (0.0)A <sup>2</sup>	0.01 (0.0)A	0.26 (0.1)AB	1.8 (0.4)B	3.6 (0.7)C	6.3 (0.8)D	7.7 (0.8)D	5.8 (0.5)D

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using protected F-test.

<sup>2</sup> Capital letters are based on Repeated Measures analysis with sample date (time) as the repeated function.

Figure 20. Number of wheat stem sawfly eggs (A) or larvae (B) per 10 stems ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends, Molt, Montana 1998.



Pre and Post Harvest Percent WSS Cut Stems Analysis

Rocky: Rampart

Pre harvest and post harvest cutting by WSS was significantly different among blends for the Big Sandy 1997 site. The 100% Rampart had significantly lower pre and post harvest cutting (Table 23) than the 100 Rocky and 75 Rocky/25 Rampart blend. The 50 Rocky/50 Rampart and 25 Rocky/75 Rampart were not different from 100% Rampart (Table 23). Complete harvesting of all rows at the Big Sandy (1998) site prevented collection of post harvest cutting data.

Norstar: Rampart

Pre harvest and post harvest cutting by WSS was significantly different among blends for 4 sites with the exception of Big Sandy in 1998. Complete harvesting of all rows at the Big Sandy (1998) site prevented collection of post harvest cutting data. The 100% Rampart treatment had significantly lower pre and post harvest cutting at all sites. At the Molt site the 25 Norstar/75 Rampart and 50 Norstar/50 Rampart treatments were not different from Rampart. At the Loma site, 25 Norstar/75 Rampart did not separate from the 100% Rampart (Table 24). The 100 Norstar and 75 Norstar/25 Rampart tended to have greater pre and post harvest cutting than other treatment, although these were not separated from the 50 Norstar/50 Rampart treatments at Broadview and Molt.

Table 23. Percent of wheat stem sawfly cut stems ( $\pm$  SE), pre and post harvest for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy <sup>1</sup>
100 Rocky	36.4 <sup>2</sup> (0.8)ab	39.5 (14.3)	0.0 (0.0)	9.1 (7.2)	3.0 (3.0)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	43.8 (4.8) a	31.5 (1.0)	0.8 (0.8)	9.2 (2.6)	2.7 (2.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	32.9 (5.1) abc	25.3 (4.7)	0.6 (0.6)	18.2 (9.1)	0.9 (0.5)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	32.1 (4.7) bc	23.2 (7.1)	1.6 (1.6)	6.1 (2.3)	0.3 (0.3)
100 Rampart	21.7 (4.4) c	12.2 (7.7)	0.0 (0.0)	3.7 (2.2)	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	5.51	2.89	0.61	1.71	0.62
Prob>F	0.02	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 24. Percent of wheat stem sawfly cut stems ( $\pm$  SE), pre and post harvest for Norstar: Rampart blend at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy <sup>1</sup>
100 Norstar	52.4 <sup>2</sup> (2.5) a	46.9 (NA) <sup>3</sup> a	7.2 (3.3) a	30.2 (5.8) a	3.1 (1.6)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	49.3 (1.8) a	27.0 (7.7) ab	9.2 (0.6) a	25.8 (2.9) ab	1.8 (0.9)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	34.8 (1.2) b	25.7 (2.0) ab	3.4 (0.1) ab	19.3 (1.0) ab	1.1 (0.6)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	33.0 (3.3) b	16.3 (0.9) b	3.8 (1.0) ab	16.5 (4.2) bc	1.1 (1.1)
100 Rampart	22.8 (1.4) c	4.0 (1.7) c	0.5 (0.5) b	4.1 (0.3) c	0.0 (0.0)
F statistic	26.28	11.31	3.96	6.62	1.20
Prob>F	<0.01	<0.01	0.04	0.01	NS

<sup>1</sup> Big Sandy 1998 was pre harvest cutting only. No post treatment cutting data were obtained.

<sup>2</sup> Means were separated using Duncan multiple range test at alpha = 0.05 level. Means with the same letter are not significantly different.

<sup>3</sup> For Broadview 1997, 100 Norstar treatment, only 1 rep was harvested due to seeding error, SE not available.

### Yield and Protein Analysis

#### Rocky: Rampart

Yield: There were significant differences ( $F = 20.49$ ,  $Pr < 0.01$ ,  $df = 4, 14$ ) in yield measured in kilograms per hectare (kg/ha) among Rocky: Rampart blends for the Broadview site (Table 25). The 100% Rampart blend had a significantly higher grain yield compared to all other blends at this site. 100% Rocky had significantly lower yields than other blends or 100% Rampart treatment. All other sites had no significant differences in yields among blends.

Protein: Statistical comparisons were only available for the Broadview and Molt sites. Protein samples were combined across replications at Big Sandy 1997 and 1998, and Loma sites, therefore statistical comparison of mean percent protein was not available. However, there were significant differences among blends for percent protein at both of these sites. The 100% Rampart plots had significantly greater percent protein compared to all other blend treatments (Table 26) at both sites. The 100% Rocky had significantly lower percent protein than blends and 100% Rampart plots. At the Molt site the three blended treatment were not significantly different. At the Broadview site the 25Rocky/75 Rampart was significantly higher in protein than 50 Rocky/50 Rampart, which was significantly greater than 75 Rocky/ 25 Rampart. The later was not significantly different in protein than 100% Rocky treatment.

Table 25. Kilograms per hectare ( $\pm$  SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy
100 Rocky	34.53 (4.5)	12.63 (0.7)d <sup>1</sup>	43.51 (2.2)	48.33 (4.2)	22.03 (0.3)
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	35.60 (3.7)	17.53 (1.6)c	41.49 (2.7)	60.17 (7.0)	22.63 (2.0)
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	34.47 (2.7)	19.11 (0.5)bc	42.30 (1.5)	59.50 (3.9)	21.20 (1.7)
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	41.50 (1.3)	22.78 (0.8)b	40.89 (2.0)	55.70 (2.9)	20.27(1.5)
100 Rampart	41.30 (2.8)	26.62 (2.6)a	45.72 (1.9)	51.03 (0.9)	22.53 (0.4)
F statistic	2.35	20.49	0.91	1.20	0.75
Prob>F	NS	<0.01	NS	NS	NS

19

<sup>1</sup> Means were separated using Student Newman Keuls multiple range test at alpha = 0.05 level. Means with same letter are not significantly different.

Table 26. Mean percent protein ( $\pm$  SE) for Rocky: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy
100 Rocky	13.8 <sup>1</sup>	9.7 (0.04)d <sup>2</sup>	12.6 (0.04)c	12.7 <sup>1</sup>	16.4 <sup>1</sup>
75 Rocky: 25 Rampart	13.3	10.0 (0.1)d	13.3 (0.1)b	12.1	15.3
50 Rocky: 50 Rampart	13.5	10.5 (0.1)c	13.4 (0.01)b	12.0	15.8
25 Rocky: 75 Rampart	13.9	11.1 (0.2)b	13.4 (0.03)b	13.1	16.0
100 Rampart	13.0	11.8 (0.1)a	13.6 (0.04)a	14.4	14.7
F statistic		38.85	28.23		
Prob>F		<0.01	<0.01		

<sup>1</sup> Protein samples were combined across plot replications at Big Sandy 1997 and 1998, and Loma sites. Statistical comparisons of percent protein were not available.

<sup>2</sup> Means were separated using Student Newman Keuls multiple range test at alpha = 0.05 level. Means with same letter are not significantly different.

Norstar: Rampart

Yield: There were no significant differences in among blend treatments for all sites in 1997 and 1998 (Table 27).

Protein: Both Broadview and Molts sites had significant differences ( $F = 32.70$ ,  $Pr < 0.01$ ,  $df = 4, 14$ , respectively) among blends for percent protein (Table 28). At Broadview the protein in 100% Rampart treatment was significantly higher compared to all other blend treatments. The 100% Norstar plots had greater protein than 75 Norstar/25 Rampart and 50 Norstar/50 Rampart. The 25 Norstar/75 Rampart proteins were not significantly different from 100% Norstar. At Molt the 100% Norstar treatments has significantly lower percent protein than all other blend treatments and 100% Rampart. The protein samples were combined across replications at Big Sandy 1997 and 1998, and Loma sites, therefore statistical comparisons of percent protein are not available.

Table 27. Kilograms per hectare ( $\pm$  SE) for Norstar: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy <sup>1</sup>
100 Norstar	52.8 (4.1)	28.1 (NA) <sup>2</sup>	45.4 (2.8)	51.9 (1.3)	34.5 (3.5)
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	49.2 (1.1)	28.6 (0.1)	45.2 (2.1)	58.4 (1.6)	28.4 (3.1)
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	48.3 (2.3)	32.3 (3.0)	43.9 (2.8)	61.1 (9.3)	23.2 (1.6)
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	43.8 (1.5)	30.6 (1.7)	45.0 (0.6)	50.1 (4.4)	27.8 (0.4)
100 Rampart	41.4 (1.0)	26.2 (2.6)	48.7 (0.5)	70.5 (5.0)	24.5 (1.1)
F statistic	3.26	0.04	0.39	1.92	2.63
Prob>F	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

<sup>1</sup> Big Sandy 1998, was preharvest cutting only. No postharvest cutting data was obtained.

<sup>2</sup> Broadview 1997m 100% Norstar treatment only, 1 plot replicate was harvested. SE was not available.

Table 28. Mean percent protein ( $\pm$  SE) of Norstar: Rampart blends at five locations and two years.

Treatment	1997		1998		
	Big Sandy	Broadview	Molt	Loma	Big Sandy
100 Norstar	13.4 <sup>1</sup>	10.6 (0.1)b <sup>2</sup>	12.2 (0.1)b	13.3 <sup>1</sup>	15.5 <sup>1</sup>
75 Norstar: 25 Rampart	13.5	9.5 (0.04)cd	13.7 (0.2)a	12.6	15.6
50 Norstar: 50 Rampart	13.7	9.3 (0.2)d	13.8 (0.1)a	12.4	16.1
25 Norstar: 75 Rampart	14.0	10.1 (0.1)bc	13.8 (0.1)a	13.8	15.8
100 Rampart	14.0	11.8 (0.3)a	13.8 (0.1)a	14.6	16.5
F statistic		32.70	14.10		
Prob>F		<0.01	<0.01		

95

<sup>1</sup> Protein samples were combined across plot replications at Big Sandy 1997 and 1998, and Loma sites. Statistical comparisons of percent protein are not available.

<sup>2</sup> Means were separated using Student Newman Keuls multiple range test at alpha = 0.05 level. Means with same letter are not significantly different.

## DISCUSSION

### Cultivar Blends

Cultivar mixtures have been defined as "... mixtures of genetically uniform lines of a crop species that differ only in a specific disease or pest resistance" (Browning and Frey 1981). Variety mixtures have important applications in organic (low input) and traditional (high input) agriculture. United States, Poland, Denmark and Switzerland use cereal variety mixtures extensively to control disease and pests, reduce pesticide use, increase yield and grain quality (Bowden et al. 2000). However, the use of cultivar blends for insect control has had mixed results. Blends can provide advantages such as stabilization of yield, compensation for variety effects (a resistant variety compensates for a susceptible variety or higher yielding variety compensates for a lower yielding variety) and pest control (Bowden et al. 2000). Disadvantages include time and cost in mixing blends, incompatibility of varieties in regards to agronomic characteristics (yield and quality, plant height and maturity) and the inability to manage the varieties separately (segregating high protein from low, inability to remove a winter injured variety from blends) (Bowden et al. 2001, Castro 2001).

### Wheat Stem Sawfly Populations

The WSS populations were relatively low at Big Sandy and Broadview (1.2 and 2.5 adults per sweep, respectively) in 1997. Populations ranged from low at Molt (1.2 adults per sweep), moderate at Loma (5.1 adults per sweep), too extremely high at Big

Sandy (25.5 adults per sweep) in 1998. This variation in WSS populations allowed for a comparison of blends under varying degrees of sawfly pressure. Wheat stem sawfly adult flight began mid to late May at both sites in 1997 with the flight duration ranging from 21 to 28 days. In 1998, adult flight began in mid May with duration ranging from 28 days at Big Sandy to 35 days at the Loma and Molt sites. There were significant differences between sites for rainfall and soil type. The distance between Big Sandy and Loma was about 16 km and rainfall was similar (36 to 41 cm per year) but soil type was different. Soil type for Big Sandy was sandy clay loam and Loma was a clay loam. The soil type (loam/ silt loam) and rainfall (16 to 19 cm per year) was similar for both Broadview and Molt sites. Drought conditions existed in the fall 1997 and spring 1998. Winter wheat was either not planted or torn up and replanted to spring wheat due to drought conditions in the Big Sandy/Loma area. The Big Sandy 1998 site had the only winter wheat crop for about 3 km when WSS were emerging and the spring wheat crop stage was between Zadoks 10 to 19 not a susceptible growth stage for WSS egg deposition. This could explain the high WSS adult numbers at Big Sandy, 1998. Due to the drought conditions in 1998 and soil type (sandy clay loam) Big Sandy exhibited shorter flight duration than Loma and Molt possibly due to the low moisture holding quality of sandy soil which also effected the quality of the crop.

### Blends

For all sites in 1997 and 1998, early maturing Rocky was somewhat advanced compared with medium maturing Rampart in phenological development, whereas,

medium maturing Rampart was somewhat more advanced compared with late maturing Norstar in phenological development. Peak WSS flight coincided with the WSS susceptible growth stages for Rocky, Rampart and Norstar varieties. The maturity rating is based on wheat heading date but WSS susceptible growth stages coincide within the 3-4 week emergence period. Wiess et al. 1990 suggested delaying planting to disrupt the synchronization of plant development and WSS life cycle. This project used varieties with difference in maturity to disrupt synchronization of plant and insect life cycle.

### Eggs

The peak number of eggs were detected for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends on JD 162 (11 June) and 163 (12 June) at Big Sandy and Broadview in 1997. The peak number of WSS eggs for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart occurred on JD 147 (27 May) at Big Sandy and JD 148 (28 May) at Molt in 1998. Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends differed on date of peak egg detection at the Loma site (JD 147 and JD 154, respectively). This could be due to phenological differences between varieties at this site. The variety Norstar produces more tillers than Rampart therefore there were more stems per plant at susceptible growth stages for WSS egg deposition compared to Rampart. There were no differences detected among the blend treatments for egg deposition preference for Rocky: Rampart or Norstar: Rampart blend treatments.

Larvae

Wheat stem sawfly larval infestation numbers increased during earlier sample dates but declined in numbers by the last sample date for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends. The decline in larval numbers indicates mortality, in all probability due to WSS cannibalism, environmental factors, parasitism, microorganisms and other natural predators. There were no consistent differences in larval numbers between blend treatments by the last sample date for Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart for all sites in 1997 and 1998.

Predicting Late Season WSS Larval Infestation

Regression analysis was used to predict the number of WSS larvae per 10 stems at the final sample date (right before harvest) for, Norstar: Rampart blends, Rocky: Rampart blends and data from both experiments combined using the following predictors; peak number of WSS adults detected, flight duration, Julian dates of first WSS eggs and larvae detected and peak numbers of immature stages. WSS larvae at the final sampling date for the Norstar/Rampart blends was predicted  $Y = 0 + 0.866(\text{peak number of adults per sweep})$  ( $F = 115.96$ ,  $Pr < 0.01$ ,  $r^2 = 0.82$ ). WSS larvae at the final sampling date across the Rocky: Rampart blend treatments was predicted as  $Y = 0 + 0.19(\text{adult flight duration}) + 0.24(\text{peak numbers of adults per sweep})$  ( $F = 173.3$ ,  $Pr < 0.01$ ,  $r^2 = 0.93$ ,  $df 2, 25$ ). When data from both Rocky and Norstar trials are combined, the prediction is  $Y = 0 + 0.17(\text{flight duration in days}) + 0.43(\text{peak adults per sweep})$  ( $F = 210.5$ ,  $Pr < 0.01$ ,  $r^2 = 0.89$ ,  $df 2, 50$ ). In all three cases flight duration in days and the peak number of WSS

adults per sweep were the best predictors of late season WSS larval infestation, with the best predictor in the Norstar: Rampart blends being the number of adults at the peak flight alone. In all three cases there are positive relationships between peak number of adults per sweep and flight duration with late season WSS larval infestations.

Examining some outcomes based on realistic ranges of peak flight and flight duration encountered in this project, predictions of percent late season WSS infestation are provided for Norstar: Rampart blends, Rocky: Rampart blends and both Rocky and Norstar blends combined (Tables 29, 30, and 31, respectively). Even at one WSS adult detected as peak level, the infestation levels are predicted to range from a low of 8.6 in Norstar: Rampart blends to a high of 40.4 in the Rocky: Rampart blends (Tables 29 and 30). When both Norstar and Rocky blends are examined together (Table 31) even a low number of adults present can result in a fairly substantial late season WSS larval infestation. These analyses indicate that a WSS adult monitoring program could provide benefits to producers by predicting late season WSS larval infestation. Furthermore, these analyses indicate that harvest management strategies to reduce the impact of WSS damage can be planned in advance based on results of the monitoring program and prediction. Swathing wheat crops early, before cutting and lodging has occurred is an optional management practiced that could be employed if cutting is expected to be excessive. However, at this time there are no thresholds, nominal or otherwise, that could be used to guide decisions. Validating the predictions for WSS infestations and developing thresholds are areas of potential future research. Results indicate that by focusing on adult monitoring, predictions of WSS infestation can be made and used to

make harvest decisions that could reduce the impact of this damaging pest and improve WSS management.

Table 29. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for Rocky: Rampart blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.19(\text{adult flight duration}) + 0.24(\text{peak numbers of WSS adults per sweep})$ .

Peak number of wheat stem sawfly adults per sweep	Wheat stem sawfly adult flight duration (in days)		
	20	30	40
1	40.4	59.4	78.4
2	42.8	61.8	80.8
3	45.2	64.2	83.2
5	50.0	69.0	88.0
7.5	56.0	75.0	94.0
10	62.0	81.0	100.0

Table 30. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for Norstar: Rampart blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.866(\text{peak numbers of WSS adults per sweep})$ .

Peak number of wheat stem sawfly adults per sweep	Predicted wheat stem sawfly infestation $Y = 0 + 0.866(\text{peak no. WSS adults per sweep})$
1	8.6
2	17.3
3	26.0
5	43.3
7.5	65.0
10	86.0

Table 31. Predictions of late season percent wheat stems infested with wheat stem sawfly for both Rocky and Norstar blends based on the relationship  $Y = 0 + 0.17(\text{flight duration in days}) + 0.43(\text{peak WSS adults per sweep})$ .

Peak number of wheat stem sawfly adults per sweep	Wheat stem sawfly adult flight duration (in days)		
	20	30	40
1	38.3	55.3	72.3
2	42.6	59.6	76.6
3	46.9	63.9	80.9
5	55.5	72.5	89.5
7.5	66.3	83.3	>100
10	77.0	94.0	>100

#### Yield

The Rocky: Rampart and Norstar: Rampart blends varied in yield performance at each site. Under low WSS population (Big Sandy and Broadview, 1997) Rocky: Rampart blend of 25 Rocky: 75 Rampart yielded higher than 100% Rocky but comparable to 100% Rampart (Table 25). Norstar: Rampart blends yielded comparable to or higher than 100% Rocky and 100% Rampart (pure stands). The 50 Rocky: 50 Rampart yielded the highest among the blends compared to the pure stands (Table 27).

In 1998 under moderate to high WSS populations the 75 Rocky: 25 Rampart blend yielded higher than 100% Rocky and Rampart, the other blends were comparable to or higher than the pure stands (Table 25). Norstar: Rampart blends, under low to moderate WSS populations yield comparable to 100% Norstar but lower than 100% Rampart. All Norstar: Rampart blends under high WSS population, yielded lower than the 100% Norstar and Rampart.

Protein varied among blend treatments across sites. At Broadview and Molt the Rocky: Rampart blends were comparable to 100% Rampart and higher than 100% Rocky (Table 26). The Norstar: Rampart blends had lower protein at Broadview than 100% Norstar or Rampart. At Molt the Norstar: Rampart blends were comparable to 100% Rampart but higher than 100% Norstar.

LITERATURE CITED

- Ainslie, C. N. 1920. The western grass-stem sawfly. United States Department of Agriculture, Bulletin. 841: 1-27.
- Ainslie, C. N. 1929. The western grass-stem sawfly, a pest of small grains. United States Department of Agriculture Tech. Bulletin. 157: 1-24.
- Anonymous. 1946. The wheat stem sawfly in Montana. Mimeographed Report. MT Agric. Exp. Stn. and MT Ext. Serv., Bozeman.
- Bird, R. D. 1961. Ecology of the Aspen Parkland of western Canada in relation to land use. Can. Dep. Agri. 1066: 88-89.
- Black, A. L. 1983. Cropping practices: northern great plains, pp. 397-406. In: Dryland agriculture (H. E. Dregne and W. O. Willis, eds.). American Society Agronomy, Crop Sci. Society of America, Soil Sci. Society of America: Madison, Wisconsin.
- Blodgett, S. 1996. Special Issue: Wheat stem sawfly. Montana Crop Health Report Vol. 9(11): 4-5.
- Borror, D. J., C. A. Triplehorn and N. F. Johnson. 1992. An introduction to the study of insects. Saunders College Publishers: Fort Worth, Texas.
- Bowden, R., J. Shroyer, L. Roozeboom, M. Claassen, P. Evans, B. Gordon, B. Heer, K. Janssen, J. Long, J. Martin, A. Schlegel, R. Sears, and M. Witt. 2001. Performance of wheat variety blends in Kansas. Kansas State Univ. Agri. Ext. Bull. 128: 1-6.
- Bowman, H. F., S. D. Cash, P. Bruckner, J. W. Bergman, J. L. Eckhoff, D. M. Wichman, G. D. Kushnak, G. R. Carlson, and R. N. Stougaard. 1997. Winter wheat variety performance summary in Montana. Montana State University Ext. Serv. Bull. 1098.
- Browning, J. A., and K. J. Frey. 1981. The multiline concept in theory and practice, pp. 36-37. In: Strategies for the control of cereal disease (J. F. Jenkyn and R. T. Plumb, eds.). Blackwell Scientific, London.

- Bruckner, P. L., G. D. Kushnak, J. E. Berg, D. M. Wichman, G. R. Carlson, G. F. Stallknecht, R. N. Stougaard, J. L. Eckhoff, H. F. Bowman, W. L. Morrill, R. A. Hockett, and K. A. Tilley. 1997. Registration of 'Rampart' wheat. *Crop Sci.* 37: 1004.
- Bush, L., J. E. Slosser, W. D. Worrall, and N. V. Horner. 1991. Potential of wheat cultivar mixtures for greenbug (Homoptera: Aphididae) management. *J. Econ. Entomol.* 84(5): 1619-1624.
- Byers, J. R. and K. W. May. 1991. Resurgence of wheat stem sawfly: A pest from the past. *Weekly Letter, Res. Stn., Lethbridge.* 2979: 1.
- Callenbach J. A. and M. P. Hansmeier. 1944. Wheat stem sawfly control in severely infested areas. Montana Extension Service, Circular No. 56.
- Carlson, G.R., P.L. Bruckner, J. E. Berg, G.D. Kushnak, D. M. Wichman, J. L. Eckhoff, D. A. Tilley, G. F. Stallknecht, R. N. Stougaard, H. F. Bowman, W. L. Morrill, G. A. Taylor, and E. A. Hockett. 1997. Registration of 'Vanguard' wheat. *Crop Sci.* 37:291.
- Castro, A. 2001. Cultivar mixtures. The Plant Health Instructor. DOI: 10. Online at: [www.apsnet.org/education/AdvancedPlantPath/Topics/cultivarmixtures](http://www.apsnet.org/education/AdvancedPlantPath/Topics/cultivarmixtures)
- Church, N. S. 1955. Moisture and diapause in the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Canadian Entomologist.* 87: 85-97.
- Clausen, C. P. 1977. Cephidae: Wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton). U.S. Dep. Agri. Handbook. 480: 295-297.
- Criddle, N. 1911. Injurious insects of 1910 at Treesbank, Manitoba. *J. Econ. Ent.* 4: 236-241.
- Criddle, N. 1915. The hessian-fly and the western wheat -stem saw-fly in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. Can. Dept. of Agric., Entomology Branch Bulletin. 11: 127-142.

- Criddle, N. 1917. Further observations upon the habits of the western wheat stem sawfly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Can. Dept. of Agric. Entomology Branch Bull. 4(3): 176-177.
- Criddle, N. 1922. The western wheat stem sawfly and its control. Can. Dep. Agri. Pam. 6, 8pp.
- Criddle, N. 1923. The life habits of *Cephus cinctus* Norton. in Manitoba. Canadian Entomologist. 55: 1-4.
- Davis, E. G. 1955. Status of the wheat stem sawfly in the United States in 1954. N. Dakota Agri. Exp. Stn. Bimonthly Bull. 17(5): 171-175.
- Davis, E. G. 1957. Known distribution wheat stem sawfly-1956. U. S. Dep. Agric. Coop. Econ. Insect Rep. 7(6): 1p.
- Davis, E. G. 1959. An experiment with foreign parasites to control the wheat stem sawfly. USDA/ARS Entomol. Res. Div., Cereal and Forage Insects Section. Special Report. W-104: 1-4.
- Davis, E. G., C. Benton and H. W. Somsen. 1955. Natural enemies of the wheat stem sawfly in North Dakota and Montana. N. Dak. Agri. Exp. Stn. bull. 18(2): 63-65.
- Farstad, C. W. 1938. Thelytokous parthenogenesis in *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Canadian Ent. 70: 206-207.
- Farstad, C. W. 1940. The development of western wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) in various host plants as an index of resistance. Iowa State Journal of Science. 15: 67-69.
- Farstad, C. W. 1942. Control of wheat stem sawfly in the prairie provinces. Wartime Production Series 59. Edmond Dlotier, Ottawa.
- Farstad, C. W. and A. W. Platt. 1946. The reaction of barley varieties to wheat stem sawfly attack. Sci. Agri. 26: 216-224.

- Farstad, C. W., R. Glen, L. A. Jacobson, and K. M. King. 1945. Control of wheat stem sawfly in the prairie provinces. Canada Agri. Supplies Bd., Wartime Prod. Ser., Special Pamphlet 59(revised).
- Gacek, E. 1997. Summarized variety mixture information given to polish farmers. In: Variety Mixtures in theory and practice (Wolfe, M. S., ed.). European Union Variety and Species Mixtures working group of COST Action 817. Online at: [www.scri.sari.ad.uk/TiPP](http://www.scri.sari.ad.uk/TiPP)
- Gahan, A. B. 1920. Remarks on the genus *Pleurotropis* with description of a parasite of *Trachelus tabidus* Fabricus. (Hymenoptera: Chalcidoidea). Proc. Entomol. Soc. Wash. 23:113-120.
- Gahan, A. B. 1921. Remarks on the genus *Pleurotropis* with description of a parasite of *Tachelus tabidus* Fabricus. (Hymenoptera: Chalcidoidea), Proc. Entomol. Soc. Wash. 23: 113-120.
- Goosey, H. B. and G. Johnson. 1998. Unpublished data.
- Goosey, H. B., 1999. In field distributions of the wheat stem sawfly, (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), and evaluation of selected tactics for an integrated management program. Masters of Science Thesis, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT.
- Hargreaves, M. W. M. 1993. Dry farming in the northern great plains. University Press Kansas: Lawrence, Kansas.
- Holmes, N. D. 1953. Note on *Scambus detritus* (Holmg.) (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae), a new parasite of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. Can. Entomol. 85: 339.
- Holmes, N. D. 1954. Food relations of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 86: 159-167.
- Holmes, N. D. 1956. Sawfly – still a problem for wheat growers. Can. Agric. Res. Stn. Lethbridge Weekly Letter. 1-3.

- Holmes, N. D. 1975. Effects of moisture, gravity, and light on the behavior of larvae of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Canadian Entomologist. 107: 391-401.
- Holmes, N. D. 1977. The effect of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), on the yield and quality of wheat. Canadian Entomologist. 09: 1591-1598.
- Holmes, N. D. 1982. Populations dynamics of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus*, (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in wheat. Can. Entomol. 114: 775-788.
- Holmes, N. D. 1984. The effect of light on hard red spring wheats to the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 116: 677-684.
- Holmes, N. D. and C. W. Farstad. 1956. Effects of field exposure on immature stages of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Agric. Sci. 36: 96-202.
- Holmes, N. D. and H. Hurtig. 1952. Screening tests of ten contact insecticides on wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. Sci. Serv. Res. Notes Series, Ottawa Canada, No. 8.
- Holmes, N. D. and L. K. Peterson. 1960. The influence of the host on oviposition by the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. J. Plant Sci. 40: 29-46.
- Holmes, N. D., W. A. Nelson, L. K. Peterson and C. W. Farstad. 1963. Causes of variations in effectiveness of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) as a parasite of the wheat stem sawfly. Canadian Entomologist. 95: 113-126.
- Howard, J. K. 1959. Montana high, wide and handsome. Yale University Press: New Haven, Conn.
- Ivie, M. A. 2001. On the geographic origin of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae): A new Hypothesis of introduction from northeastern Asia. Ameri. Entomol. 47(2): 84-97.

- Jackson, L. F. and R. W. Wennig. 1997. Use of wheat cultivar blends to improve grain yield and quality and reduce disease and lodging. *Field Crops Res.* 52: 261-269.
- Kemp, H. J. 1934. Studies of solid-stem wheat varieties in relation to wheat stem sawfly control. *Sci. Agri.* 15: 30-38.
- Lebsock, K. L., W. B. Noble and L. D. Sibbitt. 1967. Registration of Fortuna wheat (Reg. No. 461. *Crop Sci.* 7: 170.
- MacKay, M. R. 1956. Cytology and parthenogenesis of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Can. J. Zool.* 33: 161-174.
- Maxwell, D. E. 1955. The comparative internal larval anatomy of sawflies (Hymenoptera: Symphyta). *Can. Entomol.* 1: 1-132.
- McBride, D. 1987. Problem in west last year. Wheat stem sawfly damage high in some ND counties. *Farm and Ranch.* 28-29.
- McBride, D. 1992. Sawflies causing problems in wheat. *Agweek.* 36.
- McNeal, F. H. and M. A. Berg. 1977. Registration of Lew wheat. *Crop Sci.* 17: 674.
- McNeal, F. H., M. A. Berg and P. Jr. Luginbill. 1955. Wheat stem sawfly damage in four spring wheat varieties as influenced by date of seeding. *Agron. Journ.* 47: 522-525.
- Merz, U. and D. Valenghi. 1997. "Extenso" production and cereal mixtures in Switzerland. In: Variety Mixtures in theory and practice (Wolfe, M. S., ed.). European Union Variety and Species Mixtures working group of COST Action 817. Online at: [www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TIPP](http://www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TIPP)
- Montana State University Extension Service. 1997. Montana crop health report. Special edition: Wheat stem sawfly. *Crop Health Report* 10: 1-7.
- Morrill, W. L. 1985. Wheat stem sawfly. *MT Crop Health Rep.* 10: 2.

- Morrill, W. L. 1997. The wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), and associated parasitoids in the northern Great Plains of North America. Trends in Entomology Vol. 1: 171-174.
- Morrill, W. L. and G. D. Kushnak. 1996. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) adaptation to winter wheat. Environ. Entomol. 25(5): 1128-1132.
- Morrill, W. L., D. L. Weaver and G. D. Johnson. 2001. Trap strip and field border modification for management of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). J. Entomol. Sci. 36(1): 34-45.
- Morrill, W. L., G. D. Kushnak and J. W. Gabor. 1998. Parasitism of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) in Montana. Biol. Control. 12: 159-163.
- Morrill, W. L., G. D. Kushnak, P. L. Bruckner, and J. W. Gabor. 1994. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) damage, rates of parasitism, and overwinter survival in resistant wheat lines. J. Econ. Entomol. 87(5): 1373-1376.
- Morrill, W. L., J. W. Gabor, and D. Wichman. 1993. Mortality of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) at low temperatures. Environ. Entomol. 22(6): 1358-1361.
- Munck, L. 1997. Variety mixtures: 19 years of experience in Denmark. In: Variety Mixtures in theory and practice (Wolfe, M. S., ed). European Union Variety and Species Mixtures working group of COST Action 817. Online at: [www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TiPP](http://www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TiPP)
- Munro, J. A., N. Ward, and R. L. Post. 1949. Wheat stem sawfly. N.Dak. Agri. Col. Bimonthly Bull. 11: 85-91.
- Nelson, W. A. 1953. Observation on hyperparasitism of the wheat stem sawfly *Cephus cinctus* Nort. Can. Ent. 85: 249-251.
- Nelson, W. A. and C. W. Farstad. 1953. Biology of *Bracon cephi* (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Braconidae), an important native parasite of the wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Nort. (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), in western Canada. Can. Entomol. 85: 103-107.

- Newton, A. C. and J. S. Swanston. 1999. Cereal variety mixtures reducing inputs and improving yield and quality – why isn't everybody growing them? Scottish Crop Res. Ins. Ann. Report for 1998/1999. 55-59.
- Painter, R. H. 1953. The wheat stem sawfly in Kansas. Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science. 56(4): 432-434.
- Platt, A. W. 1941. The influence of some environmental factors on the expression of the solid stem character in certain wheat varieties. Sci. Agri. 22: 139-151.
- Platt, A. W. and C. W. Farstad. 1946. The reaction of wheat varieties to wheat stem sawfly attack. Sci. Agri. 26: 231-247.
- Platt, A. W. and C. W. Farstad. 1953. Breeding spring wheats for resistance to wheat stem sawfly attack. Proc. 7th Pacific Sci. Cong., Canada 4L 215-220.
- Platt, A. W., C. W. Farstad and J. A. Callenbach. 1948. The reaction of Rescue wheat to sawfly damage. Sci. Agri. 28: 154-161.
- Ries, D. T. 1926. A biological study of *Cephus pygmaeus* (Linnaeus), the wheat-stem sawfly. J. Agric. Res. 32: 277-295.
- Riley, C. V. and C. L. Marlatt. 1891. Wheat and grass sawflies. Insect Life, U. S. Dept. Agric. Div. of Entomol., Periodical Bull. 4: 168-179.
- Runyon, J. B., R. L. Hurley, W. L. Morrill and D. K. Weaver. 2001. Distinguishing adults of *Bracon cephi* and *B. lissogaster* (Hymenoptera: Cephidae), parasitoids of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). Can. Entomol. 133: 215-217.
- Runyon, J.B., W. L. Morrill, D. K. Weaver, and P. R. Miller. 2002. Parasitism of the wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Braconidae) in wheat fields bordering tilled and untilled fallow in Montana. J. Econ. Entomol. 95(6): 1130-1134.
- Salt, G. 1931. Parasites of the wheat stem sawfly *Cephus pygmaeus* (L.) in England. Bul. Entomol. Res. 22: 479-545.

- Salt, R. W. 1946. Moisture relationships of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton). I. Some effects of desiccation. *Scientific Agric.* 26: 622-630.
- Salt, R. W. 1947. Some effects of temperature on the production and elimination of diapause in wheat stem sawfly. *Can. J. Research* 25: 86.
- SAS Institute. 2000. SAS/STAT user's guide. SAS Institute, Cary, NC.
- Seamans, H. L. 1945. A preliminary report on the climatology of the wheat stem sawfly (*Cephus cinctus* Norton) on the Canadian prairies. *Scientific Agric.* 25: 432-457.
- Shanower, T. 2000. Unpublished data.
- Sharma, R. C. and H. J. Dubin. 1996. Effects of wheat cultivar mixtures on spot blotch (*Bipolaris sorokiniana*) and grain yield. *Field Crops Res.* 48: 95-101.
- Sij, J. W., G. R. Bowers, M. O. Way and D. L. Boykin. 1999. Insect defoliation and population dynamics in blends of resistant and susceptible soybean cultivars. *Agron. J.* 91: 82-87.
- Smith, D. R. 1979. Superfamily Cephioidea, Family Cephidae. *Catalog of Hymenoptera in America north of Mexico.* Smithsonian Institution Press. 1: 133-137.
- Smith, R. W. 1959. Status in Ontario of *Collyria calcitrator* (Grav) (Hymenoptera: Ichneumonidae) and of *Pediobius beneficus* (Gahan) (Hymenoptera: Eulophidae) as parasites of the European wheat stem sawfly *Cephus pygmaeus* (L.) (Hymenoptera: Cephidae). *Can. Entomol.* 91: 697-700.
- Smith, R. W. 1961. Notes on parasites of the wheat stem sawfly *Cephus pygmaeus* (L.) (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) from continental Europe. *Can. Ent.* 93: 714-717.
- Stoa, T. E. 1947. Rescue wheat. *N. Dak. Agri. Exp. Stn. Bull.* 10(2): 43-45.
- Taylor, M. E. 1976. Wheat stem sawfly, *Cephus cinctus* Norton. *Can. Dept. Agric.* 2pp.

- Taylor, R. L. 1931. On "Dyar's Rule" and its application to sawfly larvae. Amer. Ent. Soc. Ann. 24: 451-456.
- Udine, E. J., 1941. The black grain stem sawfly and the European wheat stem sawfly in the United States. U. S. Dept. Agric. Circ. 607: 11-9.
- Villacorta, A., R. A. Bell and J. A. Callenbach. 1971. Influence of high temperature and light on postdiapause development of the wheat stem sawfly. J. Econ. Entomol. 64: 749-751.
- Wallace, L. E. 1962. Field-plot tests of chemicals for wheat stem sawfly control. J. Econ. Entomol. 55(6): 909-912.
- Wallace, L. E. and F. H. McNeal. 1966. Stem sawflies of economic importance in grain crops in the United States. U. S. Dept. Agric. Tech. Bull. 1350: 1-50.
- Webster, F. M. and G. I. Reeves. 1910. The western grass-stem sawfly. (*Cephus occidentalis* Riley and Marlatt). U. S. Dept. Agric. Bur. Entomol. Circular. 117: 1-6.
- Weiss, M. J. and W. L. Morrill. 1985. The wheat stem sawfly. Montana Agric. Exp. Stn. Montguide MT8506 A. B-12: 1-4.
- Weiss, M. J. and W. L. Morrill. 1992. Wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) revisited. American Entomologist. 38(4): 241-245.
- Weiss, M. J., N. R. Riveland, L.L. Reitz and T.C. Olson. 1990. Influence of resistant and susceptible cultivar blends of hard red spring wheat on wheat stem sawfly (Hymenoptera: Cephidae) damage and wheat quality parameters. J. Econ. Entomol. 83: 255-259.
- Weiss, M. J., W.L. Morrill and L. L. Reitz. 1987. Influence of planting date and spring tillage on the wheat stem sawfly. MT. Agri. Exp. Stn. Ag. Res. 4: 2-5.

Wolfe, M. S. 1997. Variety mixtures: concept and value. In: Variety Mixtures in theory and practice (Wolfe, M. S., ed). European Union Variety and Species Mixtures working group of COST Action 817. Online at: [www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TIPP](http://www.scri.sari.ac.uk/TIPP)

Zadoks, J. C., T. T. Chang and C. F. Konzak. 1974. A decimal code for the growth stages of cereals. *Weed Res.* 14: 415-421.

Zhu, Y., H. Chen, J. Fan, Y. Wang, Y. Li, J. Chen, J. X. Fan, S. Yang, L. Hu, H. Leung, T. W. Mew, P. Teng, Z. Wang, and C. C. Mundt. 2000. Genetic diversity and disease control in rice. *Nature* 406: 718-722.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Cereal Grain Development Stages by Zadoks (Zadoks 1974).

Zadoks Scale	Description	Zadoks Scale	Description
	<b>Germination</b>		<b>Booting</b>
00	Dry seed	40	-----
01	Start of imbibition	41	Flag leaf sheath extending
03	Imbibition complete	45	Boots just swollen
05	Radicle emerged from seed	47	Flag leaf sheath opening
07	Coleoptile emerged from seed	49	First awns visible
09	Leaf just at coleoptile tip		
	<b>Seedling growth</b>	50	<b>Inflorescence emergence</b>
10	First leaf through coleoptile	53	First spikelet of inflorescence visible
11	First leaf unfolded	55	1/4 of inflorescence emerged
12	2 leaves unfolded	57	1/2 of inflorescence emerged
13	3 leaves unfolded	59	3/4 of inflorescence emerged
14	4 leaves unfolded		Emergence of inflorescence completed
15	5 leaves unfolded		
16	6 leaves unfolded	60	<b>Anthesis</b>
17	7 leaves unfolded	65	Beginning of anthesis
18	8 leaves unfolded	69	Anthesis half-way
19	9 or more leaves unfolded		Anthesis complete
	<b>Tillering</b>	70	<b>Milk development</b>
20	Main shoot only	71	-----
21	Main shoot and 1 tiller	73	Kernel watery ripe
22	Main shoot and 2 tillers	75	Early milk
23	Main shoot and 3 tillers	77	Medium milk
24	Main shoot and 4 tillers		Late milk
25	Main shoot and 5 tillers		
26	Main shoot and 6 tillers	80	<b>Dough development</b>
27	Main shoot and 7 tillers	83	-----
28	Main shoot and 8 tillers	85	Early dough
29	Main shoot and 9 or more tillers	87	Soft dough
	<b>Stem elongation</b>		Hard dough
30	Pseudo stem erection	90	
31	1st node detectable	91	<b>Ripening</b>
32	2nd node detectable	92	-----
33	3rd node detectable	93	Kernel hard (difficult to divide by thumbnail)
34	4th node detectable	94	Kernel hard (can no longer be dented by thumbnail)
35	5th node detectable	95	Kernel loosening in daytime
36	6th node detectable	96	Overripe, straw dead and collapsing
37	Flag leaf just visible	97	Seed dormant
39	Flag leaf ligule/collar just visible	98	Viable seed giving 50% germination
		99	Seed not dormant
			Secondary dormancy induced
			Secondary dormancy lost

APPENDIX B

Summary of DATE and DATE X TREATMENT Effects in the Repeated Measures Analysis with Time as the Repeated Function.

Site, Year	Blend Treatment	WSS	Date (Time)	
			F statistic	Prob > F
Big Sandy, 1997	Rocky/Rampart	Eggs	8.55	<0.01
		Larvae	24.89	<0.01
	Norstar/Rampart	Eggs	13.85	<0.01
		Larvae	28.40	<0.01
Broadview, 1997	Rocky/Rampart	Eggs	15.75	<0.01
		Larvae	44.48	<0.01
	Norstar/Rampart	Eggs	16.03	<0.01
		Larvae	23.86	<0.01
Big Sandy, 1998	Rocky/Rampart	Eggs	63.00	<0.01
		Larvae	13.37	<0.01
	Norstar/Rampart	Eggs	61.63	<0.01
		Larvae	16.18	<0.01
Loma, 1998	Rocky/Rampart	Eggs	20.56	<0.01
		Larvae	51.28	<0.01
	Norstar/Rampart	Eggs	29.27	<0.01
		Larvae	45.03	<0.01
Molt, 1998	Rocky/Rampart	Eggs	6.96	<0.01
		Larvae	24.60	<0.01
	Norstar/Rampart	Eggs	13.49	<0.01
		Larvae	45.60	<0.01

APPENDIX C

Complete Data Set for Rocky: Rampart and  
Norstar: Rampart Blends for 1997 and 1998.





















Date	Site	Blends	Rep	Variety	Zadoks	Sternet	Internodes																	
							Eggs					Larvae					Parasitoids							
							wsse1	wsse2	wsse3	wsse4	wsse5	wssset	wssl1	wssl2	wssl3	wssl4	wssl5	wsslT	wssp1	wssp2	wssp3	wssp4	wssp5	wsspt
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	R1	65	19	5	1	0	0	0	6	0	3	4	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	R1	63	13	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	R1	63	14	3	10	3	0	0	16	0	7	18	1	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	R1	63	8	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	R1	63	8	0	1	6	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	R1	63	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	R1	63	7	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	NSR	61	16	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	8	9	2	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	NSR	61	21	3	16	0	0	0	19	0	6	18	17	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	NSR	61	9	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	7	7	2	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	NSR	64	17	3	1	3	0	0	8	0	7	7	6	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	NSR	64	25	4	33	2	0	0	39	0	2	13	6	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	NSR	64	13	1	11	0	1	0	13	0	6	10	3	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	NSR	62	26	2	8	0	0	0	10	0	7	9	2	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	NSR	62	22	6	17	0	0	0	23	1	9	12	5	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	NSR	62	25	0	9	7	0	0	16	0	3	8	5	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	NSR	60	12	3	2	0	0	0	5	0	2	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	NSR	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	NSR	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	R2	61	21	1	6	1	0	0	8	0	2	5	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	R2	61	28	3	10	3	0	0	16	0	0	18	3	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	R2	61	19	0	11	8	1	0	20	0	1	6	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	R2	62	17	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	3	2	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	R2	62	19	1	6	6	0	0	13	0	2	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	R2	62	26	1	5	0	0	0	6	0	2	3	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	R2	62	5	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	R2	62	3	1	3	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	R2	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	R2	68	2	1	0	2	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	R2	68	3	1	5	0	0	0	6	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	R2	68	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/11/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	KY	76	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	11	1	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	KY	76	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	KY	76	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	7	1	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	KY	70	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	KY	70	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	2	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	KY	70	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	KY	70	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	KY	70	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	KY	70	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	KY	70	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0



Date	Site	Blends	Rep	Variety	Zadoks	Stemct	Internodes																				
							Eggs					Larvae					Parasitoids										
							wsse1	wsse2	wsse3	wsse4	wsse5	wssset	wssl1	wssl2	wssl3	wssl4	wssl5	wsslT	wssp1	wssp2	wssp3	wssp4	wssp5	wsspt			
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	KY	70	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	KY	70	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	11	5	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	KY	70	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	7	0	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	KY	73	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	3	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	KY	73	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	KY	73	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	KY	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	KY	76	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	2	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	KY	76	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	KY	79	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	5	3	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	KY	79	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	KY	79	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	3	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	KY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	R1	75	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	R1	75	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	20	6	0	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	R1	75	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	R1	80	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	R1	80	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	R1	80	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	7	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	R1	71	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	3	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	R1	71	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	R1	71	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	R1	74	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	4	0	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	R1	74	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	R1	74	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	R1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	NSR	80	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	NSR	80	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	9	5	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	NSR	80	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	5	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	NSR	74	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4	2	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	NSR	74	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	6	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	3	NSR	74	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	1	NSR	76	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4	9	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	2	NSR	76	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	8	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	50/50	3	NSR	76	28	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	17	10	10	0	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	1	NSR	70	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	6	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	2	NSR	70	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	25/75	3	NSR	70	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	1	R2	69	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	2	R2	69	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	2	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	100/0	3	R2	69	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	1	R2	74	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1997	Big Sandy	75/25	2	R2	74	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0











Date	Site	Blends	Rep	Variety	Zadoks	Stemct	Internodes																				
							Eggs						Larvae					Parasitoids									
							wsse1	wsse2	wsse3	wsse4	wsse5	wset	wssl1	wssl2	wssl3	wssl4	wssl5	wssl6	wssp1	wssp2	wssp3	wssp4	wssp5	wsspt			
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	1	NSR	87	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	3	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	2	NSR	87	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	3	NSR	87	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	1	NSR	88	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	3	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	2	NSR	88	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	3	NSR	88	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	5	2	0	19	0	0	1	0	0	1
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	1	NSR	86	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	2	NSR	86	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	3	NSR	86	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	1	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	1	NSR	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	2	NSR	85	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	3	NSR	85	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	1	R2	86	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	2	R2	86	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	5	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	100/0	3	R2	86	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	1	R2	83	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	7	1	29	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	2	R2	83	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	1	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	75/25	3	R2	83	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	1	R2	88	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	2	R2	88	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	50/50	3	R2	88	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	1	R2	87	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	2	R2	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	25/75	3	R2	87	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	1	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	2	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/1/1998	Loma	0/100	3	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	1	NSR	92	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	9	1	26	0	3	1	2	0	6
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	2	NSR	92	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	3	NSR	92	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	5	2	22	0	0	3	2	1	6
7/14/1998	Loma	75/25	1	NSR	92	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	0	13	0	1	1	1	0	3
7/14/1998	Loma	75/25	2	NSR	92	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	10	0	22	0	2	4	2	0	8	8
7/14/1998	Loma	75/25	3	NSR	92	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	0	10	0	1	1	2	0	4	4
7/14/1998	Loma	50/50	1	NSR	92	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	2	17	0	0	2	0	0	2
7/14/1998	Loma	50/50	2	NSR	92	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	1	12	0	0	0	1	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	50/50	3	NSR	92	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	25/75	1	NSR	92	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	25/75	2	NSR	92	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	25/75	3	NSR	92	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	1	R2	92	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	18	11	0	36	0	0	0	1	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	2	R2	92	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	9	0	22	0	0	0	1	0	1
7/14/1998	Loma	100/0	3	R2	92	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	75/25	1	R2	92	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	2	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/14/1998	Loma	75/25	2	R2	92	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0







Date	Site	Blends	Rep	Variety	Zadoks	Stemct	Internodes																	
							Eggs					Larvae					Parasitoids							
							wsse1	wsse2	wsse3	wsse4	wsse5	wset	wssl1	wssl2	wssl3	wssl4	wssl5	wssl6	wssp1	wssp2	wssp3	wssp4	wssp5	wsspt
6/18/1998	Molt	75/25	3	R2	65	17	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	50/50	1	R2	65	21	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	4	12	1	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	50/50	2	R2	65	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	50/50	3	R2	65	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	25/75	1	R2	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	25/75	2	R2	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	25/75	3	R2	65	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	0/100	1	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	0/100	2	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/18/1998	Molt	0/100	3	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	1	NSR	63	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	7	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	2	NSR	63	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	7	0	24	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	3	NSR	63	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	13	6	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	1	NSR	60	8	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	2	NSR	60	14	2	1	1	0	4	0	1	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	3	NSR	60	27	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	1	NSR	66	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	2	NSR	66	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	3	NSR	66	24	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	2	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	1	NSR	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	2	NSR	64	9	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	3	NSR	64	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	1	R2	67	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	2	R2	67	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	100/0	3	R2	67	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	1	R2	66	12	0	2	0	0	2	0	3	6	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	2	R2	66	12	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	75/25	3	R2	66	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	5	2	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	1	R2	72	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	2	R2	72	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	50/50	3	R2	72	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	1	R2	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	2	R2	68	12	0	2	0	0	2	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	25/75	3	R2	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	1	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	2	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/25/1998	Molt	0/100	3	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	100/0	1	NSR	67	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	2	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	100/0	2	NSR	67	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	3	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	100/0	3	NSR	67	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	75/25	1	NSR	66	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	1	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	75/25	2	NSR	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	75/25	3	NSR	66	32	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	7	3	1	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	50/50	1	NSR	69	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	50/50	2	NSR	69	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	50/50	3	NSR	69	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7/2/1998	Molt	25/75	1	NSR	72	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	2	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0



Date	Site	Blends	Rep	Variety	Zadoks	Stemct	Internodes																	
							Eggs					Larvae					Parasitoids							
							wsse1	wsse2	wsse3	wsse4	wsse5	wset	wssL1	wssL2	wssL3	wssL4	wssL5	wssLt	wssp1	wssp2	wssp3	wssp4	wssp5	wsspt
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	1	NSR	44	20	0	7	80	78	0	165	0	0	1	15	6	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	2	NSR	44	15	0	1	90	23	1	115	0	0	6	12	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	3	NSR	44	16	0	34	60	27	0	121	0	0	9	12	1	22	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	1	NSR	42	10	0	12	81	78	3	174	0	0	0	11	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	2	NSR	42	3	0	10	15	13	0	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	3	NSR	42	15	0	17	78	25	0	120	0	0	9	10	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	1	NSR	44	9	0	15	94	46	0	155	0	0	8	17	0	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	2	NSR	44	19	0	9	75	99	2	185	0	0	5	13	3	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	3	NSR	44	10	0	8	25	0	0	33	0	1	2	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	1	NSR	42	5	0	9	74	34	0	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	2	NSR	42	4	0	0	6	7	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	3	NSR	42	3	0	0	10	20	0	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	1	R2	49	18	0	14	48	32	0	94	0	0	8	12	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	2	R2	49	11	0	8	50	30	0	88	0	0	3	5	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	3	R2	49	10	0	4	17	7	1	29	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	1	R2	49	16	0	5	54	34	0	93	0	0	8	4	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	2	R2	49	7	0	5	20	8	0	33	0	0	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	3	R2	49	13	0	7	21	8	1	37	0	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	1	R2	48	5	0	2	12	6	0	20	0	0	1	3	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	2	R2	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	3	R2	48	5	0	0	17	4	0	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	1	R2	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	2	R2	38	11	1	7	13	6	0	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	3	R2	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	1	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	2	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5/27/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	3	R2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	1	NSR	50	13	0	8	64	34	0	106	0	0	8	2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	2	NSR	50	31	0	21	30	14	0	65	0	0	15	9	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	3	NSR	50	18	0	31	7	0	0	38	0	7	13	8	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	1	NSR	49	14	0	17	41	29	0	87	0	2	10	12	2	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	2	NSR	49	16	1	22	21	2	0	46	0	0	9	9	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	3	NSR	49	29	2	52	48	2	0	104	0	0	25	7	0	32	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	1	NSR	52	12	0	25	27	0	1	53	0	0	10	12	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	2	NSR	52	9	0	12	23	3	0	38	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	50/50	3	NSR	52	9	0	16	14	0	0	30	0	0	4	6	1	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	1	NSR	54	11	1	7	8	0	0	16	0	3	7	9	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	2	NSR	54	12	0	20	17	6	0	43	0	2	6	3	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	25/75	3	NSR	54	5	0	7	10	0	0	17	0	8	2	3	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	1	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	2	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	0/100	3	NSR	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	1	R2	56	13	0	4	3	0	0	7	0	1	12	7	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	2	R2	56	23	0	1	36	12	0	49	0	0	8	17	1	26	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	100/0	3	R2	56	20	1	6	4	2	0	13	0	3	25	22	2	52	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	1	R2	56	11	0	3	9	3	0	15	0	0	10	9	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
6/3/1998	Big Sandy	75/25	2	R2	56	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0































MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY - BOZEMAN



3 1762 10383211 7